CHRISTOPHANA.

The MYSTERY of

Eating the Flesh

AND

Drinking the Blood

OF

CHRIST.

And the *Modus*, or Manner thereof

DISCOVERED.

Joh. 6. 53.

Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.

Tale tuum Corpus nobis Divine Redemptor } Cento Virgilianus.
Quale est corporibus Panis Vinumq; Virorum } *Eclog.* 5.

——*Si quid novisti rectius istis*
Candidus imperti; Si non, his utere mecum. Hor.

By EDM. PORTER, D.D. and Prebend of *Norwich*.

London: Printed by *Tho. Newcomb* for *Tho. Collins*, at the *Middle-Temple-Gate* in *Fleetstreet*. 1680.

138 g. 219

TO THE READER.

IT pleased his *Gracious Majesty* in his Royal Prudence and Piety, by His Declaration of *Octob.* 14. in the 14 Year of His Reign, to direct his Clergy of this Realm, to insist chiefly in their Ordinary Sermons on *Catechistical Doctrines.* Which gracious Directions, if obeyed and performed, may (with Gods Assistance) produce tranquillity and peace in this Church, and increase knowledge and comfort in the People. K. Charl. II.

Of all those weighty fundamental

Doctrines, none is more desirable and comfortable, than that of the *Sacred Eucharist* (if it may be rightly understood) which upon serious consideration, and in our time hath been added to our elder Catechism, about sixty years since, by the Authority of our then *Royal Beauclerk King JAMES* of ever happy Memory. And yet at this day, no one part of all those necessary Doctrines is less apprehended, or understood by the People.

That Question which the *Jewish* John 6. Disciples moved, *How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?* hath never yet been so fully and clearly answered, but that People are still to seek; and it is too evidently perceived, that they do not understand one half of that Mystery: Neither do we much marvel thereat, because indeed, the whole Christian World, both anciently, and also in our days, hath been, not only exceedingly exercised, but also seen

to

to have been posed in that Mysterious question, as may appear by the multitude of Books published upon that Subject, both by the *Fathers*, and also since by many Learned men of the *Reformed & Unreformed Churches*, wherein many passages of the Fathers are produced, which are so mysticall and ambiguous, that Men of contrary Persuasions, challenge their authorities to assert their differing Interests.

Yet of the multitude of Quorations out of the Fathers, by *Cardinal Bellarmine*, not one doth fully reach or extend to, and clearly prove the new doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; neither is that word found in any of those ancient Fathers by him alledged, nor doth the *Modus*, or manner of Eating the Flesh of Christ appear to have been defined, or described by them, although we find the words *Mutation*, *Conversion*, *Transformation*, *Transfiguration* and *Transelementation*,

often used by them in the Question of the *Eucharist*, which come not home to the newer Invention of *Transubstantion*. The misunderstanding of those former words, hath been long ago blown off by the Reformed Writers; and the observation of *Origen* did very early, and timely preclude the dangerous acception of those ambiguous passages, which dropt from the Pens of the Fathers, who on the 10. Chapter of *Leviticus*, and in the 7th. Homily saith, *Est & in Evangelio litera, quæ occidit eum, qui non spiritualiter advertit, ut nisi manducaveritis carnem meam*, &c i. There is even in the Gospel a Letter which killeth him, who doth not consider it to be spiritually meant, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man*, &c.

Orig. in Lev. n. 7.

Many Sentences are found in the Fathers, which are doubtfull, and seem so near the brink, that many Learned men by misunderstanding them, have fal'n into the ditch.

St. *Cyprian* (or ſome other under his name) had written, *Deus uſq; hodiè corpus ſuum creat*, That God unto this day doth ſtil create his own Body. And *Panis iſte non effigie ſed natura mutatus, factus caro*, i. that the Sacramental Bread is changed, not in ſhape, but in its nature, and is made Fleſh. *Cyp. de Cœna.*

After him St. *Hilary* ſaith, *Nos vere verbum carnem, cibo Dominico ſumimus*, that Communicants do truly receive the Word made Fleſh in the Lords Supper. *Hil. de Tyin. l. 8.*

After him St. *Ambroſe* ſaid, *Sermo Chriſti mutat ſpecies elementorum*, And *Panis iſte, ubi acceſſerit Conſecratio, fit corpus Chriſti*, i. That the words of Chriſt did change the Sacramental Elements, ſo that by the words of Conſecration, the Bread is made the Body of Chriſt. *Ambr. de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4.*

After him St. *Chryſ ſtome* ſaid, *Chriſtus carnem ſuam nobis reliquit, & ipſam habens, aſcendit*, That Chriſt left *Chryſ. H...*

his Flesh with us, and yet took it with him when he Ascended.

Cyril Hierof. Myst. 4. But the words of St. *Cyril* (if they be his own) seem more harsh than the former, and require a more charitable glose, to reconcile them with the truth of this Mystery, where he saith, *Christus, ut aquam in vinum mutabat in nuptiis, sic vinum in Sanguinem transtulisse credendus est in Cœna*--- And addeth, *Panis qui videtur, non est panis; nec Vinum, vinum, sed Sanguis Christi,* John 2. i. As Christ turned water into wine at the Marriage, so it is to be believed, that he turned wine into Blood at his last Supper, wherein that which seemeth Bread, is not Bread, nor is the Wine, Wine; but it is the Blood of Christ.

If these Fathers, by these words meant only a Sacramental change of the Elements, *viz.* of the *use*, *name*, *signification and operation* of them, we willingly assent; but if they meant a

real

real change of the matter, ſubſtance, or eſſence of thoſe Creatures, we utterly diſſent.

As for thoſe words of Mutation before mentioned, which are uſed in this queſtion, both by the Latine and Greek Fathers, we ſay, that the word *Transformatio*, Μεταποίησις ſignifieth but a *new formality*, or σχέσις, *or conſideration and account* put upon the Holy Bread, although it continueth in its own ſubſtance, bread. As when of cloth a Gown is made, or of wood a Chair, or of gold a Ring, the ſubſtances of Cloth, Wood and Gold, ſtill remain, although a new name or appellation is put on them.

So the word *Tarnsfiguration*, Μεταχηματισμὸς is uſed, becauſe the elements by Dedication or Conſecration to ſo great, & holy an uſe, are made more than they were naturaly of themſelves before, and are conſidered, not as only meer Bread and Wine, but as figures

gures and Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, and this by Consecration or Sacramental constitution, not φύσει but θέσει.

So the word *Transelementation*, Μεταστοιχείωσις, if it be meant and understood of the advancement, preferment or dignity added to the Elements of *Bread and Wine*, so as, that after Consecration to that Spiritual use, they are to be considered not as only *Bread and Wine*, or only as *Elements*, (so far we assent) because of meer *Elements* they are made *Sacraments*. Thus *Theodoret* very judiciously observeth, that Christ in the Holy Supper changed the names of the Elements, *Non mutans naturam, sed adjiciens gratiam, viz.* that he graced those signs or Sacraments with the title or appellation of his own *Body and Blood*, although they still retained their former substance, figure and form; for so he expressly declares in his

Theod. in Eranist. Dial. 1.

his third *Dialogue*, *Manent in priore substantia, figura & forma.* *Id. Ibid. Dial. 3.*

In like manner the words of St. *Austin* on the 33. *Psalm* are to be understood, where he saith, *Christus in manibus suis ferebatur, quando dixit hoc est Corpus meum*, i. Christ was carried in his own hands, when he said, *This is my Body*: That which he then bare in his hands was only the Sacrament of his Body, which yet he called his Body, although the Sacrament is but the sign thereof, *signum rei*, but (as other signs often are) it is called by the name of the thing signified, *Res signi.* The former is mentioned and meant in the Institution of that Sacrament, *Mat.* 26. 26. The latter is mentioned, *John* 6. 53. which is the very reality of the thing it self; for by those words of Eating and Drinking, Christ declared the necessity of an Union or Conjunction of our flesh and blood with His, in order to our Redemption, *Aug. Psal. 33. hom. 1.* *Mat. 26. 26.* *John 6. 53.*

demption, and so to Life, saying, *Except ye Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, &c. ye have no life in you.*

It may reasonably be thought, that many learned *Romanists*, do not really believe that impossible Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, who yet either for fear, or hope of profit, do profess and teach the same; for great are the privileges and profits that arise from it; and as the Prophet saith, *the Priests teach for hire, and the Prophets divine for money.* The Fathers often observed, that evil spirits used to speak from the belly of *Pythonists*, who are therefore called *Ventriloqui*, upon those words of *Isaias*, *Quærite ventriloquos*. *Origen* saith, that the Prophet pointed at such Ecclesiasticks as would teach for their own belly, or profit; for ever since the Curse was laid on the Serpent, *That he should go on his belly*; Satan hath got advantage by such of his Instruments, *whose*

Mich. 3.11.

Is. 8.19. *Orig. in Lev.*

Gen. 3.14 Phil. 3.19.

god

god is their belly. Surely, if that doctrine were not profitable to the Teachers thereof, it would soon be as despicable at *Rome*, as it is now with us.

One *Cassius* a *Roman* Judge, when any Man was accused at his Tribunal for some heinous fact, he would first enquire, *Cui bono*, what profit might accrue thereby to the accused, if his accusation were true? And when *Rullus* a Tribune very earnestly urged for the *Lex Agraria*, i. for power to make sale of all the *Roman* Provinces, he was first required to quit himself from suspicion of his own Covetousness, *Si Populo Consulis remove te à suspitione commodi tui.* If the *Roman* Priests would faithfully instruct the People in this gracious and comfortable Mystery, they should forbear making such gain as they do, by the consequences of their Doctrine

Tul. Orat. pro Roscio Amer. s. 4

Id. Orat. contra Rullum.

ctrine thereof, which otherwise may be thought to be the *Diana of Rome*, like that other of *Ephesus*, *a craft by which they have their wealth*, for of all their *Legend of Romances*, none are so profitable to them as this, as *Pope Leo* the Tenth profanely said of the whole History of Christ, *Quantas opes nobis peperit illa fabula de Christo*? We that are but By-standers or Lookers on, may wonder at their Priests, as *Cato* sometimes did at the old *Aruspices*, how one of them meeting with another, can forbear laughing in their sleeves, considering how grosly they have abused the People.

Acts 19.25.

Plat.

Tul. de Divinat. lib. 2.

This little Essay concerning the Flesh and Blood of Christ, is like to find such entertainment with them, as himself had on Earth, *To be for a Sign that shall be spoken against*; and possibly it may find as little acceptance

tance with ſome among us, particularly in that part hereof, wherein the propagation or traduction of our Souls is aſſerted, the denial whereof I eſteem to be a *Philoſophical Hereſie*, as much diſturbing the Doctrine of our Church, concerning *Univerſal Redemption*, for ſo *Epiphanius* accounts the errors of *Epicureans*, *Stoicks*, and *Pythagoreans* among his Hereſies. *Epiph. Her. 8.*

But yet, becauſe our Church doth not expreſly define that, or limit and declare the *Modus* or Way of Eating the Fleſh, or Drinking the Blood of Chriſt, therefore the pious and diligent Diſquiſition of the truth and manner thereof (without gainſaying the Doctrine eſtabliſhed herein) I conceive, ſhould be freely permitted, neither ſhould any mans private Opinion (although of another Judgment) preſcribe to us, or hinder this our Inquiſition

quisition, seeing it is not Magisterially dictated, but humbly offered, as an *Essay*: And also, because many of the right Pious and Learned Fathers, have with great judgment and industry described, and directed us in this very way, as will appear to the Reader of this Book.

THE

THE PREFACE.

IN order to the profitable Perusal of this Book, we are first to consider, how the Son of God *came to be concerned and interested in the Affairs of* Mankind; *especially, in the grand work of Redemption and Salvation.*

This Work was resolved and concluded before the Creation, *either of Mankind, or of the World, by vertue of a* Secret, *but a most Gracious* Covenant, *transacted between the Father and the Son from Eternity, which Covenant is often mentioned in the Gospel, under the title of the* Everlasting Covenant, *and is called* the Eternal Purpose, which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord; and the Everlasting Gospel. *In all which places the word* Αἰώνιον *is used.*

Heb. 13.20. Eph. 3.11. Rev. 14.6

We

We cannot apprehend any other Conditions in this Covenant, but only, that the Godhead in the Person *of the* Eternal Father, *required performance of the future Laws to be impoſed on Mankind, the intended Creature, with promiſe of* Life *to the Performer, and the penalty of* Death *to the Tranſgreſſor.*

To theſe covenanted Conditions, the ſame Godhead *in the Perſon of the* Eternal Son, *reſtipulated and agreed, that Mankind ſhould either perform the ſaid Laws, or ſo ſuffer. This we conceive to be that Covenant, and alſo to be atteſted by the ſame Godhead, in the* Perſon *of the* Eternal Spirit *of the Father and the Son, who alſo untill this day (as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh)* beareth witneſs with our Spirit; *And ſo do all the Three Divine Perſons, all of them being but* One God of Truth, *as St.* John *ſaith,* There are Three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and theſe Three are One. *Upon theſe premiſed Reaſons it is, (as I conceive) that the Apoſtle calls Chriſt* [illegible] i. *Surety, or Vide-juſſor.*

Rom. 8. 16.

1 John 5. 7.

Heb. 7. 22.

In order to the performance of this Covenant, we are next to conſider that God the Son *aſſumed our Humane Nature, and became* perfect Man, *and in that Humane Nature, did actually and perfectly perform that*

whole

whole Law or Covenant, for which he was engaged, in the behalf of Mankind; whereupon it is said of the Son, In the Volume of the Book it is written of me, to do thy will O God, (in Capite libri) *that is*, in notitia Prædestinationis æternæ, *saith the Expositor. The Writing in the Volume of the Book signifies, that he was preordained, or predestinated from Eternity so to do. He had said before*, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldest not, but a Body thou hast prepared for me— then said I, lo I come; *all which words were taken out of the* 40*th. Psalm. From hence it is, that* God the Son *is called the* Angel, *or* Messenger of the Govenant, *because he was interested and sent, for performance of the said Covenant. And therefore the whole Flock of Mankind was committed to him, as his Sheep, to be ordered and governed; for so it is expresly said*, that the Father gave them to him; *and He is therefore called by St.* Peter, the great Shepherd of the Sheep.

Heb. 10. 7. *Dionys. Car. in loc.* Mal. 3, 1. John 10. 29. 1 Pet. 2. 25.

This Engagement of the Son (*as Surety for Mankind*) *occasioned those words of the two great Apostles, for thus St.* Paul *writeth of God*, He hath chosen us in him (*Christ*) before the Foundation of the World; *and*, He hath saved us— according to his own purpose and Grace, which

Eph. 1, 4. 2 Tim. 1. 9.

was given us in Christ Jesus, before the
Tit. 1. 2. world began. *And*, In hope of Eternal life, which God that cannot lie, promised before the World began. *Just so St.* Peter
1 Pet. *saith upon the same reason*, You were not
1. 18. redeemed with corruptible things— but
19. with the precious Blood of Christ— who
20. was fore-ordained, before the Foundation of the World.

These expressions of Chosing us in Christ, *and of* Grace given us in Christ, *and of* Christ fore-ordained, *and of* Life promised, *and that* before the Foundation of the World. *And all these, only* in, and for Christ, *must needs relate to that aforesaid* Eternal purpose, Covenant *or Agreement, beeween God the Father and God the Son, before the Creation.*

For to whom could the Promise be made, before either Man, or Angel, or Archangel, or any Creatures were made, but only to the Eternal Word, *or Son of the Father? And why to him? but only, because the Son entred into that Covenant, and thereby became the Surety and Undertaker for Mankind. Therefore to him only was this Promise made, and in him, and for him to Mankind. And by vertue of this Covenant, the Lord Jesus became necessarily obliged, both to perform the Law, and also to undergo his bit-*

ter

ter passions of death, as himself often acknowledged, and all the four Evangelists have recorded from his mouth, that He must suffer many things, and be killed. Mat. 16.21. Mar. 8.31. Luke 24.46. Joh. 3.14.

All this being presumed and granted, there is yet one thing more (of the greatest concernment to us) to be considered, viz. how his Obedience in performing the Law, and his Death for the transgressions thereof, can be satisfactory to Divine Justice for us, seeing God hath often declared, that one shall not be punished for another, especially an Innocent for a malefactor; which seems to be our case, for we are the Transgressors, but Christ is innocent, yet he is punished, and we quitted.

Our Answer is, that Christ, and Mankind, *are not to be looked on as* Two, *but as* One. *Nor is his death, the death of one for another, but of the same; He as a Surety, and we as the principal Debtor; He as the Head, and we as the Members of the same Body. The* Surety *and the* principal, *are but one Person in Law, and the Head, and the other parts are both one, and the same Body in Nature.*

Therefore, that the proceedings of the Godhead, concerning the work of Mans Redemption, might appear to be contrived, not only with infinite Mercy, *but also with exact* Justice. *God at the beginning so ordered, that the Redeemer, and the Redeemed should be*

united

United in One original Fountain, who to that end planted all the Bodies and Souls both of Christ, and of all Mankind, in that One First Man, *from whose Flesh and Soul, both Christ, and all Mankind, have derived their Bodies and their Souls. In this consisteth our* Union *with Christ, and hence it is, that Christ and we are accounted but* One, *and this is that* Union *which was meant, and described by Christ under those figurative words, of* Eating his Flesh, and Drinking his Blood. *The clear demonstration and proof whereof, is the whole, and only design of this ensuing Treatise.*

The learned Romanists *I conceive, do perfectly understand, that the benefits which come by Christ, cannot otherwise with justice be communicated to Mankind, but only by the Union of Christ with us,* viz. *of his Flesh with our flesh, and of his Soul with our souls; And therefore they have phansied this Union to be effected, by an Oral and carnal Eating of his living Flesh, and Drinking his Blood in the Sacred Eucharist, by their way of* Transubstantiation.

For the learned French *Cardinal of* Perron, *in his Book of the Eucharist, written in* French, *affirmeth, that the real natural Presence of Christ in the Sacrament is to greatest purpose, because the Residence of Christs*

Natural

Natural Body in our bodies, doth really and ſubſtantially joyn us unto God, eſtabliſhing a true and real Unity between God and Men. Thus far he, which is obſerved by Dr. Jer. Taylor *in his Book, intitled* The Real Preſence and Spiritual of Chriſt in the Sacrament, *pag.* 50.

We alſo confeſs the neceſſity of this Union, but by another way, which is plain, evident and comfortable, as it is deſcribed in this Book, as I truſt will appear to the Reader. So that no need will be of that Roman *Subterfuge, and pretence of their horrid, unreaſonable and impoſſible* Mode *by an Oral, groſs, carnal and literal Eating of his Fleſh, and Drinking his Blood, with which Impoſture, a great part of the Chriſtian World hath been a long time abuſed; but by the cool and ſober peruſal of this Diſcourſe, the Ingennous* Romaniſt *may happily in ſome meaſure be undeceived.*

The moſt compleat and perfect Union of Chriſt with Man, conſiſteth in five things. 1. Carne, *in Fleſh.* 2. Anima, *in Soul.* 3. Spiritu, *in Spirit.* 4. Vadimonio, *in Covenant or Suretyſhip.* 5. Fide *in Faith.*

The Union which I ſhall chiefly endeavour to deſcribe in this Tractate, conſiſteth in the two firſt of theſe, which I firmly believe to be intended, and meant in that Speech of Chriſt, Joh. 6. 53. Except ye Eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, *&c.*

Except ye Eat the Flesh of the
Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, &c.

THE Fleſh of Chriſt.

CHAP. I.

HE that attempteth to diſcover the grand myſtery of *Eating and Drinking the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt*, muſt begin his Work very early, even at the Creation of our firſt Parents, or rather, before the foundation of the World. Becauſe, the moſt wiſe, merciſull, and juſt Godhead, had deſigned the redemption of Mankind from Eternity by *God the Son*: And did lay the foundation, and the frame, order, and method thereof in the firſt Man, and the firſt Woman,

man, from whom every man and woman that are, were, or hereafter shall be born, with Christ himself also, have derived both their Flesh, and their Souls, that so an Union and conjunction might be made of the Redeemer with the Redeemed; without which Union, the Son of God could not be fitly qualified to perform with *Justice* the great Work of Redemption of Mankind.

Concerning this Union, those words of Christ are to be understood. *John* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood*; and those other words *Mat.* 26. 26. *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*; both must needs be true, because *Truth* hath spoken them: The former were meant of the real, and substantial Union and conjunction of our flesh with his Flesh, and of our souls with his Soul; the latter were meant of the Representation or similitude of our true, real and substantial union with Christ, in his whole humane Nature, signified to us by the Sacramental eating and drinking of Bread and Wine, as it was before represented to the *Israelites* in eating the flesh of the *Paschal Lamb*. For as with them, and with us, The Lamb, and Bread and Wine, were really to be taken into our bodies, and do really nourish us, and unite themselves with our bodies, and grow into

Joh. 6. 53.
Mat. 26. 26.

one

one bulk with us: So Christ with Mankind must be united, and be One with us, otherwise he cannot with the *strictness of Divine Justice* be the Redeemer of Mankind, neither could man be capable of redemption by him.

Concerning the truth and reality of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of Christ the Redeemer; the *Reformed Churches*, and also the *Unreformed* do both agree, and yet exceedingly differ, and disagree in the manner, and way thereof.

1. The *Roman Transubstantiators* would have us believe, that Christ is eaten in the Sacrament, really; pretending, that the Bread and Wine are *transubstantiated*, or rather *annihilated*; and that the whole Christ is brought into the room thereof, and so eaten.

But this cannot be the *mode*, or way of eating Christ, because the eating and drinking by him meant, must have been in all former and past Generations, and must still stand firm and true, although the Sacrament or *Eucharist* had never been instituted; for *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, *Noah*, and *Adam* himself must have eaten so, as is here meant, else they could not be redeemed by Christ. And this Eating of Christ was true and real, before he was actually Born or In-

carnate. St. *Paul* ſaith, *Our Fathers did eat the ſame meat, and drink of the ſame Rock that followed, and that Rock was Chriſt*; therefore they did eat Chriſt, ſo as he meant.

1 Cor. 10. 3.

2. The *Lutheran Conſubſtantiators* would have men believe, that the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt literally underſtood, are really, carnally, and groſly received, in, and with the Sacramental bread and wine.

But neither can this way be true, becauſe the Eating here meant muſt have been, and ſtill is, without the Sacrament thereof; for the fleſh of Chriſt is now, and hath been eaten by thoſe that never heard of, nor ever did receive, or communicate in the Sacrament, for Children, Heathens, *Turks* and *Jews*, and the moſt profane Chriſtians, muſt have eaten Chriſt, otherwiſe they could have no poſſibility, or be in any capacity of Redemption: Yet the Scriptures, the primitive Fathers, and the Church of *England* do clearly declare, that the benefit of Redemption belongeth, and is offered to the whole World, to all, and every Man and Woman, as our Church Catechiſm teacheth.

God the Son hath redeemed me, and all Mankind.

3. The *Zuinglians*, who are called *Sacramentarians*, would have men believe that Eating the fleſh, and Drinking the blood o Chriſt, is meant only of receiving the ſigns

figures,

figures or Sacraments thereof, *viz.* by bread and wine in the Eucharist.

But neither can this way be the right meaning thereof, because we must truly, and really receive the very thing it self; for we must corporally be united with the flesh of Christ, and really, and truly must our Souls be united with the Soul of Christ, else no redemption can possibly be, either of our bodies, or of our Souls by him. *Calvin* upon those words, *This is my Body*; very truly affirmeth, *Neque fallax est Christus, qui vacuis figuris nos ludat--Mihi extra controversiam est--Veritatem hic, cum suo signo conjunctam esse.* (1.) Christ did not delude us with empty figures, I doubt not at all, but that the truth was joyned with the sign. *Calvin.* 1 Cor. 11. 24.

4. The Church of *England* doth not (to my apprehension) clearly determine of the *Modus*, or manner of Eating the Flesh, or drinking the blood of Christ, either in the Sacrament, or out of the Sacrament; yet thus far this Church proceedeth in the mystery of the holy Supper, and saith in the 28th Article, that it is *the Sacrament of Redemption*, just so as St. *Cyprian* had before written of the same thing in an Epistle to *Cæcilius*, wherein he calleth the Lords Supper *Sacramentum Redemptionis*; because thereby, as by an holy sign, we are taught *Art. Relig.* 28. *Cyp.* 1. *epist.* 3.

the manner, way, and method used by Christ in the work of our Redemption.

The Church of *England* again declareth in *the Office of the Eucharist*, that the faithfull and penitent Receivers do *spiritually eat and drink the Flesh and Blood of Christ, that they dwell in Christ, and Christ in them, that they be One with Christ, and Christ with them*; the meaning is, that the holy Supper is the Sacrament, or mysterious sign of our Union with the flesh of Christ, and with the blood or Soul of Christ, just as both S. *Austin*, and after him S. *Anselm* called it *Sacramentum Unitatis*. (2.) The Sacrament of Union, and the very word *Communion* (as this Sacrament is called) signifieth the same. *Communio* is all one with *counio*, or *unio cum*; because the sacramental Eating and Drinking representeth the Union, or conjunction of the flesh, and soul of Christ with our flesh and soul, without which neither our bodies, nor our Souls can be by him redeemed.

Aug. in Joan 26. Anſel. in Mat. 26.

I will not at present engage or meddle with the doctrine, or meaning of the words in the mystery of the holy Supper of our Lord, which was but the sign of the grand, and real mystery of the Eating the flesh of Christ, of which only I am now to treat, in relation to those Words of Christ in the

the 6. Chapter of St. *John*, before the Holy Supper was instituted, of which words, my purpose and earnest endeavour is to find out, and to discover the meaning, and true sense; and my hearty desire and prayer, that my Labours herein may in some measure conduce to an agreement between dissenting Parties.

The *Roman*, and also the Reformed Church-Writers, men of great wisdom, Learning and sobriety, have spent their precious time and labours, something (as I humbly conceive) besides the matter, purpose and intent of those words of Christ.

1. The *Romanists* have laboured too much, to assert and prove a carnal, gross and literate eating of the very flesh of Christ orally; grounding their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* upon those two Speeches of Christ before mentioned; but with ill success, having so much been perplexed in answering and excusing the impossibilities, and the unprofitableness of such an Exposition, that they were forced to flie to the old Poetical refuge of Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς, or *miracles*, whereof they say there are *eleven* in effecting their Transubstantiation; we may ad a *twelfth*, which to me seemeth the greatest of all, *viz.* that so many wise, and learned men should profess and believe such un-

unnecessary, and manifest impossibilities.

2. The Writers of the reformed Church have imployed their time and labour in a negative way, principally in confuting the impossibility of that *Roman* Doctrine, and in proving that we do not Orally eat the very flesh of Christ, for although they acknowledge that Speech of Christ to be true, when he said, *Except ye eat the Flesh*, &c. yet they truly affirm, that they are not to be understood of a gross, carnal, and oral Eating; This negative Doctrine occasioned a pretence to the adverse Party, to accuse them of an attempt to confute and gainsay the words of Christ.

These practices on both sides, I conceive, have bin the cause of hiding or obscuring the most gracious, and comfortable doctrine of our Union with the body or flesh of Christ; and consequently of the doctrine of our Redemption by him, both of them being certainly implyed in those words of Eating and Drinking.

It is therefore to be wished, that such Learned men for the future, would imploy their studies in a positive Way, in shewing how those Mysterious Words of Christ are true, and to be rightly understood, rather than in a negative confutation of a wrong sense, which work solidly performed, would

clear

clear the darkneſs of that Myſtery, and be exceedingly comfortable to pious Souls, and evidently declare the Wiſdom, Righteouſneſs and Mercy of our ever Bleſſed Redeemer.

CHAP. II.

IN order to the opening of this Myſtery, we are firſt to enquire what our Redeemer meant by thoſe words of *Eating and Drinking my Fleſh and Blood*, which certainly are not to be underſtood *literally*, but *figuratively*.

The Reader may obſerve, that the grand Myſteries of our Religion in the Holy Scripture, are repreſented and exemplified darkly, as under a cloud, or veiled with the ſimilitude of Eating.

1. The Tree of life in Paradiſe was planted to be eaten of; it was the figure or type of Chriſt, who called himſelf *a Tree*, Luk. 23. 31. and *a Vine*, John 15. 5. and *the Life*, John 14. 16. and is called *Rev.* 2. 7. *The Tree of Life*. The typical Tree was ordained to preſerve and continue a worldy life, as Chriſt the ſubſtantial Tree to procure an Eternal, and heavenly Life.

Although that Tree of life was permitted by the Godhead to be eaten of by our

first Parents, yet they never did eat of it, because in the state of their Innocency they perceived not any need thereof, being in a condition of *not dying* (as Divines say) *Potuit* Adam *non mori*; nor was any malady upon them, so as to need any medicine to cure them of any disease; But afterward, when by their transgression they had incurred the curse of *Mortality*, they were excluded from that Tree of life, *least* Gen. 3. 22. *they should take of the Tree of Life, and live for ever*; whereby the Commination of God Gen. 2. 17. should have failed, who had said, *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.*

There was another Tree in Paradise called the *Tree of Knowledge*, of which the Gen. 2. 9. Man was forbidden to eat, although it is said, that *the Woman saw that the Tree was good for food, and pleasant to the eye, and to be desired to make one wise.* So though Gen. 3. 6. they abstained from the Tree permitted, yet they did eat of the Tree forbidden.

The Tree of Life represented Christ, the Tree of knowledge represented the Law, as *Tertullian* very judiciously affirmeth and Tert. adv. Judæos. proveth. That law concerning the Tree, was *Primordialis Lex*, the first Law that was imposed on Man, and had been large enough (saith he) if it had been obeyed. *Lex* Id. ibid. *data Adæ & Evæ, est quasi matrix omnium*

præ-

præceptorum Dei quæ pullularunt postea, data per Mosem; It was as the Womb, out of which sprang the Ten Commandments given by *Moses*; and in that first Law, all those Moral laws are couched and implied.

As the *Tree of Life* signifieth Christ with all his Evangelical mercies; And the Eating of that Tree signified the Union, conjunction and inherence of Mankind in him: So the Tree of knowledge signified *the Law* with all its strictness, rigour and penalties. And the forbidding to Eat of that Tree, signified, that we should not trust to, or rely on it, or expect to obtain life by performance of the law, or justification and Salvation by the works thereof: This I conceive to be the meaning of forbidding the Tree of knowledge, as relating to the Law; because I find divers passages concerning the said law, even in the Gospel, which to me signifie the same, as *by the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified*; and, *The Law worketh Wrath*; it is called also *The Ministration of death*; and *the Ministration of condemnation*. Therefore we are to depend on, and feed and nourish our hope and faith, only by Christ, who is the only true *Tree of Life*, and not to confide in the *Law*, because we cannot possibly by our own selves perform it, nor by any other

Rom. 3. 20. Rom. 4. 15. 2 Cor. 3. 7, 9.

other way, but only in, by, and through Christ, and this by that interest which we have in him, by our union with his Flesh and Soul.

2. The Manna (every one knows) signified Christ. The eating of Manna signified the union of Manna with the Bodies, or flesh of the *Israelites*, which was a type of the necessity of Mans union with the flesh of the Redeemer.

3. The Paschal Lamb signified the Lamb of God; And the Eating thereof signified the conjunction or union of the flesh of the Redeemer with the Redeemed.

4. The legal Sacrifices, represented Christ to be sacrificed on the Altar of the Cross: And they were to be eaten, (except *Holocausts.*) The eating of them signified mans union with the Antitype, that is Christ, even as that which we eat becomes one with us, it grows into one bulk with our bodies, and is united with us, and is animated with the same life and soul with our bodies, it lives, it dies, and is buried, and riseth again with us, and continueth with us after the Resurrection everlastingly; in like manner, the flesh of Christ is united with our flesh, without which Union there can be no Redemption of us by him, nor indeed any resurrection of our Bodies, nor Immortality

tality of our Souls, more than of the bodies and ſouls of brute Creatures; (as will appear hereafter) therefore Chriſt ſaid, *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of Man, &c. you have no life in you.* And in the Sacramental ſign of this real Myſtery, he ſaid, *Take, eat, this is my Body* (that is) my Body is to you ſuch a thing, as this Bread which you eat is to be; which will be concorporated and joyned in One, and united with your bodies, and will be animated with the ſame life and ſoul, wherewith all the parts of your body were formerly endued and informed. John 6. Mat. 26.

If it be enquired, why the very individual fleſh of Chriſt ſhould not be in truth, and reality, and propriety of ſpeech confeſſed to be eaten, in full correſpondence with the Type, *viz.* the fleſh of the Paſchal Lamb, which was really eaten?

Our Anſwer is, That if there were no other way, or ſignification of Eating the fleſh of Chriſt, but only *Orally*; or as the Letter ſoundeth; then of neceſſity, it muſt be ſo meant and underſtood, and muſt be ſo eaten, as the Paſchal Lamb and the Sacrifices were. But there is another way and meaning thereof, wherein the fleſh of Chriſt is truly ſaid to be eaten, both before he was incarnate or born, and alſo after

after his Ascension into Heaven, in both
1 Cor. 10. 3. which times it was, and is, impossible to be eaten Orally.

For when his Disciples were offended at the mentioning of Eating his Flesh, he said
Joh. 6. 62. *What and if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* as if he had said, my flesh must have been eaten, so as I mean, even before I took human flesh upon me. And also, after my assumed flesh shall be ascended locally into Heaven, and not be any more upon Earth, or out of Heaven untill my return at the last Judgment, and therefore far out of the reach of any mortal hand or mouth; therefore it cannot be meant literally of any oral, or gross carnal Eating.

If we shall rest satisfied, and seek no further into this Mysterious Eating, than only to believe, that Christ doth daily in the Sacrament thereof vouchsafe, and condescend to exhibit his very true Body in, or under the *species* or appearance of Bread, or Wafer-cakes, and that his very Body is so, really existant in many thousand distant places in the same minute of time; which to humane Reason is incredible, and contrary to Philosophy, and even to our senses: If we can swallow this vain, impossible and improbable Camel, it would be a quicke expedi-

cult, and an easie or lazy gloss to unriddle this grand mystery by; which hath a long time perplexed, and posed the Christian World.

Concerning which, (good Christian Reader) I do here tender my poor Meditations, in humility, not *Magisterially*, but with due submission to the judgment of my Superiors; most earnestly begging of God instruction, illumination, and a right understanding herein, and wholly trusting and relying upon him, who by his *Apostle* hath thus directed and promised, that, *If any want wisdom, let him ask it of God—and it shall be given him*; Jam. 1. 5 in hope therefore of his assistance, I proceed to examination of the particulars, of *Eating the Flesh, and Drinking the Blood* of our Redeemer.

CHAP. III.

THe words of Christ, from whose lips never any guile, or untruth fell, are these. *Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*; here are *two Verilies*, or *Amens*, which are often used by S. *John* only, whereas the other Evangelists never use but one *Amen* in the weightiest Joh. 6. 53

tiest narrations; this double Assertion fa
ling from the mouth of Christ, argueth
certain, and undeniable truth, which be
cause it is hard and mysterious, yet nece
sarily to be received and believed, there
fore it is thus strongly and vehemently a
firmed, and must be believed, although
be not at first understood, for this is
character of Christian Faith to confess th
Words of God to be true, although we d
not understand them, as *Prosper* saith, *Ma*
gna fortitudo est consentionis, cui ad sequ
dam veritatem, autoritas sufficit, latente r
tione. *The valiantness of Christian Faith
in consenting to Truth by authority of Go
Word, when the reason thereof doth n
appear.*

Prosp. de Vos. Gen. l. 2. c. 2.

John 6. 52. The *Jews* asked (whilest Christ w
with them on earth) *How can this Man give
his Flesh to eat?* We may now much rath
ask the same question, seeing his Flesh
now in Heaven far remote from us, an
certainly his Flesh since his Ascension, ne
ver was on Earth to this day: Therefo
to eat his Flesh orally, grossly, and literall
understood, is both unpossible, and (
Christ affirmed) unprofitable. *The Fl*

John 6. 63. *profiteth nothing*, or, if to eat his Flesh
rally, were necessary and profitable, ho
can we come at it? The Apostle advise

Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into Heaven, that is, to bring Christ down? That which is meant by *Eating his Flesh*, is done already, and brought home to us. Ro. 10. 6.

Eating in Scripture phrase doth not always signifie Oral eating, nor doth it so signifie in those Words of Christ; *David*, *Abraham*, and the *Antediluvian Patriarchs* must so have eaten Christ, as Eating here signifieth, else they could not have been redeemable by him. Christ said, *Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after Righteousness*, upon which words S. *Austin* asketh, *Quis dilaniat justitiam?* and addeth *ne putetis morsibus fieri*. Who can eat Righteousness, think not that this Eating is done by morsels: So, *Pharisees devoured widows houses*, yet they did not Eat them. Men are often said to feed their eyes, *Pascere oculos*, and *Animum pictura pascit inani* in the Poet; yet neither our Eyes, nor our Souls can eat. The Church exhorteth to *feed on Christ in our hearts*, this is done without a *Mouth-eating*. The *Psalmist* saith, *They eat up my People as bread*, and *They have devoured* Jacob, that is, saith *Austin* upon that place, *Gentes, multos in suum malignum corpus, seu Societatem transire, terrendo coegerunt*; the Heathens have forced many into their malignant body and association by Mat. 5. 6. Mat. 23. 14. *Virg. Æn.* 1. P. 14. 4. *Aug. in* Ps. 78.

terrifying them, yet not by Oral eating. *Ezekiel* is commanded to eat the Roll, and ſo is St. *John* commanded to eat the Book, which ſignified, that they ſhould deeply take the words thereof into their conſideration, to conſider and ponder them in their hearts and minds. *Peter*, one of the brothers of *Lombard*, is commonly called *Petrus Comeſtor*, and another great Writer was called *Jacobus de Voragine*, *Peter* the Eater, and *James* the Gulf or devourer; not for gormondizing of meat, but becauſe of multitude of Books, which by their Readings they had devoured and digeſted, as *Cato* was called *heluo librorum*, a very Glutton of Books by *Tully*.

Ez. k. 3. 3, 10. Rev. 10. 9

Tull. de Fin. lib. 3.

But above all the former *Eatings* that Divine *Extaſie*, or Trance, or Rapture of St. *Peter*, recorded *Acts* 10. doth clearly ſhew, that there is another way and meaning of Scriptural Eating, which is not *Oral*; for in that Viſion there was preſented to St. *Peter* a *veſſel deſcending from Heaven, wherein were all manner of four-footed beaſts of the earth, and wild beaſts, and creeping things, and fouls of the air*, and a Voice came to him, *riſe Peter, kill and eat.*

Acts 10. 13.

By theſe ſeveral creatures, the Nations, or *Gentiles* are ſignified, as formerly in the viſion of *Daniel*, the four *Monarchies* were

Dan. 7.

preſen-

preſented to him in the ſhapes and reſemblances of four Beaſts. The firſt as a *Lion*, the ſecond as a *Bear*, the third as a *Leopard*, the fourth as a *dreadfull Beaſt with iron teeth*, both theſe apparitions of thoſe creatures, ſignified People and Nations.

It is a very mean conceit, and a low gloſs of ſome late Expoſitors, put upon that myſterious Viſion of St. *Peter*, by which was ſignified the calling of the *Gentiles* to the Goſpel. But thoſe Writers would have no more meant thereby, but only a permiſſion to eat of ſuch Creatures as were formerly forbidden, as *unclean* by the *ceremonial Law*; yet we find not mention of any *fiſh* in the Veſſel, although ſome ſorts of fiſh are mentioned amongſt forbidden meats as *unclean*, viz. *ſuch as have not fins or ſcales*; whereby we may reaſonably conclude, that the Viſion had a farther reach and project than Eating; the mention of wild beaſts ſignified the miſſion of the Goſpel to ſuch People as were not then civilized, ſuch as are now called *ſylveſtres Populi*, Savages, barbarous and lawleſs; ſome as yet are called the *wild Iriſh*. Surely the viſion, under the apparition of Beaſts and fowls, pointed at Men only who are converſant on the Earth, and in the Air, as beaſts and fouls are, but live not in the Water. Levit. 11. 10.

St. *Peter* was commanded to *kill and eat the Gentiles*, which if literally understood, would be most barbarous, and also impossible. But to *kill* signified to mortifie them, to convert or turn them from their Idolatry, to kill their Heathenism in them, as St. *Austin* saith upon those words, *Occiduntur, cum Christiani fiunt ex Paganis.* The Heathens are said to be kill'd, when of Pagans they are made Christians; and again upon the word *kill* he saith, *Macta, id est, occide quod fuerant, fac quod tu es.* Kill in them what they were, and make them such as thou art. Neither is *Peter* commanded only, to kill or convert them, but also to take the *Gentiles* so mortified and converted into the Body, Fellowship and Communion of the Church; and so the same Father expounds the word *Eat. Petrum recipit Gentes in communionem Ecclesiæ, quasi escam, ut incorporentur.* By Eating, *Peter* is required to receive the *Gentiles* into the mystical body of the Church, and to incorporate them, as meat is concorporated with our natural bodies. This Exposition is evidently confirmed by St. *Peter* himself, for after this Vision, he went forthwith to *Cornelius* a *Roman and Gentile*, he preached Christ to him, and converted him, and baptized him, and thereby

Aug. in Ps. 149.

Id. Ps. 30.

Id. lib. 50. homiliarum hom. 45. 30. 10.

thereby received, and incorporated him in the Corporation of the Church.

The Eating of the flesh of Christ in those mysterious words of Christ, is in like manner to be understood, so as to signifie an ἕνωσις, or rather a συσάρκωσις, that is, our *Incorporation* or *Concorporation* with Christ, or the union or conjunction of our bodies with his Body, and so doth the forenamed Father expound those very words of Christ, *Except ye eat*, &c. *Nisi incorporentur Christo*, and, *Qui venit ad Christum, incorporatur ei*, to eat the flesh of Christ, signifieth to be incorporated in him, as every one must be that cometh to him. Aug. in l. c.

Peter did not Orally eat the Nations, neither is it required by those words, that we should Orally eat the flesh of Christ; what frantick *Fanatick* will so understand those word of Christ? *If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off*, &c. as actually to the Letter, to cut off his own hand, or pull out his own eye. Mat. 5.

From the grounds and reasons premised, my Conclusion is, and ever will be, that the Eating of the flesh of Christ is meant, and to be understood only of the union or conjunction of our flesh with his Flesh, or our *concarnation* with him, so as to be *flesh of his Flesh*, as the Apostle saith; without Gal. 5. 30.

which Union there will be no possibility of Redemption of our bodies by the bitter passions, and death of his blessed Body. But how this conjunction, and union of his Body, and our bodies was contrived and effected, is next to be enquired.

CHAP. IV.

IT is certainly necessary for our Redemption, and in order thereto, that first there must be a true, real, and corporal union, or conjunction of our flesh with the Flesh of our Redeemer; which corporal union was contrived and effected by the most Wise, Just, and Mercifull Godhead, and was by him designed, and plotted before the Creation, on purpose to put Mankind into a capacity of Redemption, his Providence foreseeing the fall of Man, and his goodness and mercy providing the cure of *Redeemableness* by God the Son, to be in time *coincarnate* with us, and to become *Emanuel*.

For if it may appear, that the flesh or body of Christ was made of the same Materials of which our flesh and bodies are made, and if both he and we, have derived our

Flesh,

Fleſh from the ſelf-ſame lump of the firſt Man, who then can deny an Union, and conjunction of him with us in that firſt Lump?

The firſt Man was made of a piece of Earth, and the firſt Woman was derived out of the Man, and not made of another piece of Earth; for the Woman could not have been in union with Chriſt, except ſhe had been taken out of the Man, as Chriſt, and all Mankind are; nor could ſhe, or we have been capable of Redemption by Chriſt, without this union with Chriſt in the firſt Man.

Hence it is that the Apoſtle ſaith, *We are Members of his Body, of his Fleſh, and of his Bones.* The like he ſaith of Chriſt and his whole Church, *They two ſhall be one Fleſh, but I ſpeak concerning Chriſt and his Church.* This is ſaid, becauſe all Men and Women, with Chriſt alſo, were originally joyned and united in *Adam*, and therefore *Proſper* obſerveth, *Nullus eſt hominum cujus natura non erat ſuſcepta à Chriſto*; there is not any Man in the world, whoſe Nature was not aſſumed by Chriſt. *Ipſe* Adam *toto terrarum orbe ſparſus eſt*, Aug. Pſ. 95. And St. *Paul* ſaith, *God hath made of one Blood all nations of Men*, it is meant of the blood of the firſt Man, by which word *Blood* ſome-

Eph. 5. 30, 31, 32.

Proſp. ad Cap. Gallorum.

Acts 17. 26.

thing more is implied than only Flesh, as will appear hereafter, and more than Blood literally taken.

In the Old Testament, where we read of *Filius Hominis*, or Son of Man, the same words in the Original are *Ben-Adam* often. The *Genealogy* of St. *Luke* derives Christ from *Adam*, and St. *Paul* calls Christ, *the Last* Adam, as children are called by the names of their Progenitors; therefore St. *Austin*, to shew the original of all Men, with Christ himself, saith *Omnis homo terrenus est* Adam, *every Man of the Earth is* Adam; for it is as easie to apprehend Christ to be the Son of *Adam*, as to be the Son of *David*, and of *Abraham*; and as easie to understand that Christ was united with Mankind in the loins of *Adam*, as to apprehend that *Levi* was in the loins of *Abraham* when *Melchisedech* met him, which was long before *Levi* was begotten.

1 Cor. 15. 45.

Aug. Retract. l. 1. c. 16.

Mat. 1. 1.

Heb. 7. 10

Moreover, even when *Adam* was formed, there was an original corporal union of all Mankind in that one parcel of Earth, of which Man was made, which is the reason why not only *Adam*, but all his Posterity are called Earth and Dust; *O Earth, Earth, Earth hear the Word of the Lord.*

Gen. 3. 19 Jer. 22. 29.

The reason why I have said, that the Redeemer must be united, and be one with

the

the Redeemed, is, becauſe God doth not puniſh or reward eternally one for another, but the ſame that performeth or tranſgreſſeth his Laws, is puniſhed or rewarded. The Wiſe man ſaith, *He that juſtifieth the wicked, and condemneth the juſt, are both abominable to the Lord.* Prov. 17. 15. The *Jews* had a curſed and murmuring Proverb among them, *The Fathers have eaten ſour grapes, and the Childrens teeth are ſet on edge*; their meaning was, that their Fathers had committed that ſin, for which their Children were puniſhed; but God did controll that falſe imputation, ſaying, *Every one ſhall die for his own ſin*; And, *He that eateth ſour grapes, his teeth ſhall be ſet on edge*; and, *the Soul that ſinneth, it ſhall die.* So it is ſaid in the Goſpel, *Every man ſhall bear his own burthen*; and, *God judgeth according to every Mans work.* Therefore the Redeemer muſt be really united, and be as one man with the Redeemed, otherwiſe the paſſions, and Death of Chriſt the Redeemer, cannot in the exact Juſtice of the Godhead, ſatisfie for the ſins of the People. Eze. 18. 4. Jer. 31. 29. Gal. 6. 5. 1 Pet. 1. 17.

Chriſt ſaid to a young man, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments.* This muſt be confeſſed to be true, that no man can be ſaved except he perform the Law: If it be enquired, how any meer Mat. 19. 17.

man

man can enter into Life, seeing every one transgresseth the Law; We answer, that every true and faithfull Member of Christ fulfilleth the Law, because Christ hath performed it, who is *One* with his Members.

This weighty and necessary Doctrine of the union of Christ with Mankind, is evidently and plentifully declared, both in the Holy Scriptures, and also in the Writings of the Fathers (which I have elsewhere shewed at large) in the Gospel. Christ said, *I am the Vine, ye are the branches*, the root, stock, and branches of the Vine are but one Tree. St. *Paul* saith of Christ, and of men, that they are Σύμφυτοι fellow Plants, or *planted together*, planted in *Adam*, and, *we being many are one body in Christ*; and, *as the Body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many are one body*; *so is Christ*. And *your bodies are the members of Christ*, and *ye are the Body of Christ, and members in particular*; and therefore the same Apostle saith of the *Galatians*, *Ye are all one in Christ Jesus*.

Joh. 15. 5
Rom. 6. 5
Rom. 12. 5.
1 Cor. 12. 12.
1 Cor. 6. 15.
1 Cor. 12. 27.
Gal. 3. 28

The union or *Oneness* of men with Christ doth not consist only in this, that Christ communicateth his Spirit to us men, but also, in that Christ and all Mankind were originally together in the first Man, and are all derived from the flesh and blood of him,

as

as I noted before from the words of St. *Paul*, *that God made of one blood all Nations of men*; and that *one Blood* was the blood of *Adam*. Acts 17. 26.

For although we never were in the loins of Chriſt, nor derived from him, yet becauſe Chriſt, and we, and all Generations of men were originally in the loins of *Adam*, therefore in him we were then all united.

CHAP. V.

IN the next place we are to enquire, what was the Doctrine of the Fathers concerning the *Body of Chriſt*, and alſo concerning the Union of the Head with the members thereof.

1. The Body of Chriſt in Scripture hath a double ſignification. 1. It ſignifieth the *natural*, proper and individual, or perſonal Body of Chriſt, of which it is ſaid, *a woman poured ointment on his Body*, and Joſeph *begged the Body of Jeſus*. Mat. 26. 12, 27, 58

2. The Body of Chriſt ſignifieth his Body *Myſtical*, that is, the whole Corporation of Chriſt and his Members, of which it is ſaid, *He is the Head of his body the Church*. Col. 1. 18.

Chriſts *Natural body* is but a part of his *Myſtical body*, as our head is but a part of our natural body. And as the head, and other parts of our natural body are viſibly

sibly united; so Christ, and all his Members are united, and joyned by an invisible Tie or knot, both in Flesh and Soul, as will hereafter appear, as also in one *Spirit*, proceeding from Christ the Head, and communicating it self to every particular member of that great Mystical Body; as it is said of the *precious Ointment upon the Head, which ran down upon the beard of* Aaron, *and went down to the skirts of his garments*; the ointment signified the Spirit and its graces.

Psa. 133.

In consideration of this Union, by those three knots or ligaments just now mentioned, the Fathers looked on Christ and his Members, and considered them so united, as upon one Body, or one Man, or one universal Person, because there is no one man or woman in the World whose nature Christ hath not assumed, whereof St. *Ambrose* saith, *In Christo summa universalitatis est, & portio singulorum*; Christ is as the total Summ of all men, and a portion or parcel of every man. To the same purpose *Prosper* saith, *Tota Ecclesia, cum Christo capite est unus homo*, and in another place he saith, *Tota civitas Dei est unus homo, in capite & corpore: The whole Church with Christ the Head, is one Man*, and *the whole City of God is but one Man, in the head and body.*

Ambr. de chit. Sacr. To. 4. p. 146.

Prosp. Ps. 102. Id. Ps. 131.

body. St. *Austin* is very plentifull and plain in this matter of *Union*, and saith, *Unus est Christus, caput & corpus, ipse sunt ego*; and in another place, *Unus Homo caput & corpus Christi sumus, non solum Christiani*; and again, *Christus est multa membra, unum Corpus.* The meaning of all is, that they are but one Body, and are considered as one Person, for as the Head, and the other parts altogether are but one man, so Christ, and all his mystical Members are but one whole Christ; which whole mystical Body consisting of Christ the Head, and Christians the members thereof, the same Father often calleth *Christum totum*, and *Christum plenum*, and *Christum universum*, and *Plenitudinem Christi*, and *Christum diffusum*, that is, the *whole, full, universal, diffused Christ*, or *the fulness of Christ*; St. *Paul* also useth the same expression concerning Christ and his Members: *He* (God) *hath given him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his Body, the fulness* (πλήρωμα) *of him that filleth all in all.* So that Christ himself with his Church, are here said to be the *full Christ*, or *fulness of Christ.*

Aug. in Joh. Tra. 108. *Aug. Ps. 127.* *Id. Ps. 30.* *Aug. in Ps. 36. & 37. & alibi.* Eph. 1. 22, 23. Ps. 82.

And as in Scripture many are called Gods, (although *there is but one God*) because God distributes his Spirit to them. 1 Cor. 8. 5. Psal. 105. 15.

So

ſo many are called Chriſts, (*Nolite tangere Chriſtos meos*) becauſe Chriſt hath united himſelf with them, both by his Spirit, and by his Fleſh, of which union of his Fleſh himſelf ſaith, *He that eateth my fleſh, dwelleth in me, and I in him*; becauſe he hath taken his fleſh from the ſame Original, whence our fleſh is derived, therefore as our fleſh dwelleth in him, ſo his Fleſh dwelleth in us.

John 6. 56.

Epiſt. n. 3. St. *Hilary* in his 8. Book *de Trinitate*, declareth the union of the Fleſh of Chriſt with the fleſh of Men, and thoſe not only holy and ſpiritual men, but alſo with unholy and carnal men, in theſe words, *Habemus in nobis carnalibus manentem per carnem, Chriſtum*: we that are but carnal men, have Chriſt by his fleſh remaining in us. And juſt ſo writeth the venerable and bleſſed Martyr, *Archbiſhop Cranmer*, in his Book againſt *Biſh. Gardiner*, *That Chriſt did unite himſelf with us as Man by his Incarnation.* But this neceſſary Doctrine of mutual union of Chriſt and Mankind, hath been too much neglected by late Divines, who have but only hinted, or lightly touched it, whereunto, in their Diſputes concerning the *Eating of the fleſh of Chriſt*, they have been neceſſarily driven; which Doctrine is of ſuch weight, con-

concernment, that it deserveth very serious and diligent inquisition.

There is a very hard, and dark passage of St. *Paul*, concerning Christs *delivering up his Kingdom*, and of his *subjection to God*; in the Exposition thereof, many Divines have greatly and dangerously erred, in *dethroning Christ*; as if those words did signifie the Period, and utter ending of his Kingdom, which we are sure must last for ever.

The words of St. *Paul* are these, *When the end cometh, he shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father*, and *then shall the Son himself be subject to him*, &c. These words cannot possibly be rightly understood, but only by considering Christ, and his Members joyntly, as *one full and whole Christ*; for though the *Man Christ*, considered only by himself, in his own particular Person, and only in his Manhood always was, is, and for ever will be subject to the Godhead; yet the *whole Christ*, that is, not only his self alone, but his mystical Members, even his Saints, and his Elect, at, or after the *final Judgment*, shall be so subject, and so perfectly and compleatly obedient to the Godhead, as they never yet were, nor ever will be, during this World; of which Subjection 1 Cor. 15. 24. 28.

and

and Union I have elsewhere written at large

CHAP. VI.

But why doth Christ require this Eating, in these terms, and words of *the Flesh of the Son of Man?* Why might he not rather have said, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of God?* For the flesh of Christ was the flesh of God the Son, and God the Word. St. *John* saith, *the Word was made Flesh*, and his Blood is expressly called the *Blood of God* by the great Apostle, *Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood*, and St. *John* calls his life and death, the life and death of God, *Hereby we perceive the love of God, because he hath laid down his life for us.* And his Virgin Mother is often called by the Fathers, Θεοτόκος, the Parent or Mother of God.

Joh. 1. 14.

Acts 20. 28.

1 John 3. 16.

1. To this we answer. *First.* That the Son of God (considered only and singly, as the Son of God in his pure Godhead, and only as *God the Word*, and as he was *in the form of God* only, and without Incarnation) could not be our Redeemer, and if he had continued so, as to be only the Son

of

of God, as he was from Eternity, and had never taken our human Nature upon him, so as to be thereby really *the Son of Man*, he could not be the Christ, neither could any obligation, or engagement have been upon him to perform the Law, which Law was imposed only upon Mankind; neither could he have redeemed us, because he could not die, being not mortal, otherwise then by assuming our *Mortal* nature, into Personal union with his *Immortal and Divine nature*: Therefore in order to the office of a Redeemer, he must become a Man, and his flesh must needs be *the flesh of the Son of Man.*

2. *Secondly.* We say, That although the Son of God had really assumed a body and flesh some other way, and not from Man or Woman, as sometimes he did in the days of the Patriarchs in the Old Testament, as namely, when he appeared to Jacob, of which it is said, *There wrestled a Man with him till the breaking of the day.* Gen. 32. 24. And a man of War appeared to *Joshua, with his sword in his hand*, Josh. 5. 13. who is called the *Captain of the Lords host*, whom *Joshua* called *Lord*, and *fell on his face to the earth, and worshipped him, and pulled off his shoes from his feet*, Exod. 3. 5. as *Moses* was commanded before by God. Surely this was an apparition of God the

Son, in the assumed body and shape of Man, who appeared most evidently before to the Patriarch *Abraham*, of whom it is Gen. 18. written, that *the Lord appeared to* Abraham—*Three Men stood by him, they talked with him, they eat with him, and travelled toward* Sodom; one of the Three, certainly was the person of the Son of God (whoever the other two were, I will not dispute) who being here called a Man, no doubt, but he had then taken a body of Flesh upon him, howbeit that flesh and body was not derived or propagated from any man or woman, as *Tertullian* observeth, *Christus cum Angelis tunc apud* Abraham *in veritate quidem apparuit, sed nondum natæ, quia nondum nupserat*, Christ with the other two Angels did verily appear at *Abrahams* Tent in true and real flesh; yet not in flesh born, or derived from Mankind, because he was not to suffer or die in that Flesh. Therefore he could not (by reason of that assumed flesh) be called *the Son of Man*, although he was like to a real Son of Man, and but only like; and if the Son of God had still retained, and continued in that assumed body or flesh, in which he then presented himself to *Abraham*, and had not taken his human Nature otherwise, from the Virgin Mother, and so from the first Man,

Tert. adv. Marc. lib. 3. p. 421.

Man, he could not have been our Redeemer.

Such another apparition we find in the Prophet *Daniel*, who in his Vision, *saw one like the Son of Man, who came with the clouds of Heaven.* This was meant of the *Son of God*, who in *Daniels* time was not *the Son of Man*, or *Ben-David*, being then not incarnate of the Virgin; and is therefore said to be only *like the Son of Man*, or as it is said in another place of that Prophet, *One like the similitude of the Sons of men*; and *One like the appearance of the Son of Man.* Dan. 7. 13. Dan. 10. 16, 18.

But the *Redeemer* must be not in similitude or appearance only, but truly, and really the *Son of Man*, before he could be compleatly qualified for our Redeemer; because the Redeemer, and the Redeemed, must be necessarily united in flesh mutually, and must be considered and looked on by *Divine* Justice, as if they were but one man, or one Person, which was wrought and performed by the union of Christ with all Mankind in the loins of *Adam*, from whom all our bodies and souls are derived.

For the Law of God must be performed by that human Nature, upon which it was imposed, which law never hath been, and never will be perfectly kept by any meer

man; therefore the Son of God made himself the Son of man, and so, to be under and subject to the Law, and a Performer of the Law in the behalf of all the Sons and Daughters of men; as both the Old and
H.b.10.5 New Testaments declare. *Sacrifices and offerings thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared for me.* And, *In the Volume of the Book it is written of me to do thy will O God; then said he, Lo I come to do thy will*
Ps. 40.8. *O God.* And, *I delight to do thy will O my God, yea, thy Law is within my heart*; and, *by the which will we are sanctified* (or designed for Redemption) *by the Offering of the Body of Jesus Christ, once for all*: And,
Heb. 10. 10. Col. 1. 21, 22. 1 Pet. 2. 24. *You now hath he reconciled in the body of his Flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable*; and *his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.*

CHAP. VII.

THe Redeemer of Mankind must needs have been, both *the Son of God*, and also *the Son of Man*, and therefore is called *Emmanuel* or *Theanthropos*; because the Son of God (as only so) could not die, and therefore not redeem us. Nor could the Son

of

of Man (as only ſo) ſatisfie Divine Juſtice for the ſins of the World.

None can be in a condition and ſtate redeemable by Chriſt, but only *Adamites*, that is, *Adam* and his off-ſpring *Eve*, and their Poſterity; becauſe they only are united with the Redeemer in the firſt Man.

The *Apoſtate Angels* can have no Redemption, nor any benefit by the Incarnation or death of Chriſt, for want of this *Union*, becauſe (as the Apoſtle obſerveth) *He took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the Seed of* Abraham. Heb. 2. 16.

We find ſeveral addreſſes in the Goſpel, made to Chriſt by the title of *Son of David*, and we perceive by the events of them, that Chriſt did well approve of that Appellation, as by the two blind men *Mat.* 9. *Thou Son of David have mercy on us*; and by two other blind men *Mat.* 20. *Have mercy on us O Lord, thou Son of David*, and by the woman of *Canaan*, *Mat.* 15. for all of them obtained of Chriſt what they ſo deſired. The Church of *England* ſo prayeth, *O Son of David have mercy upon us*; and St. *Matthew* begins his Goſpel with *Jeſus Chriſt the Son of David.* St. *Luke* derives Chriſt through many Generations of men through *Adam*; and Chriſt himſelf very rarely, and but ſecretly calls himſelf Mat. 9. 27. 20. 3. 15. 22.

Joh. 9. 35. 37. *the Son of God*, but very often, and openly, and mostly the *Son of Man*, because by this Sonship he became *Jesus* the Saviour and Redeemer.

The *Athanasian* Creed declares, that *it is necessary to everlasting salvation, to believe rightly in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.* And the *Hymn* of St. *Ambrose* and St. *Austin* (dayly repeated in our Churches) thus declareth the way and means used by the Son of God, to qualifie his Divine Person so, as to be a fit Redeemer. *When thou tookest upon thee to deliver Man, thou didst not abhor the Virgins Womb*; by all these expressions it appeareth, that the Redeemership of Christ did consist, not only in his *Godhead*, but also in his *Manhood*, in neither *singly*, but in both *jointly*. Both Christ himself, and all Generations of men must have proceeded from one Original, otherwise Christ could not be the *Redeemer of all the World*; And if any one Man in the World can be found, that descended not from *Adam*, Christ cannot be the Redeemer of that man.

There were divers *Heresies* raised in the Primitive times of the Church, which depraved the Doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ, and thereby greatly disturbed, even nulled the Doctrine of Redemption, and

and therefore the Fathers took ſpecial notice of them, and ſtrongly confuted them.

1. The ancient Hereſie of the *Valentinians* was, that *the Fleſh of Chriſt came from Heaven, and only paſſed through the Womb of the Virgin Mary, as water through a conduit pipe*; But the Angel ſaid to her, *Thou ſhalt conceive in thy womb*; and her Cozen *Elizabeth* being then inſpired by God, ſaid to her, *Bleſſed is the Fruit of thy Womb*; therefore if Chriſt were *Conceived*, and were the *Fruit* of the womb, he ſurely was not only a *Paſſenger*, or only as a *Traveller* in an Inn, or as a Gueſt or Stranger, but he is expreſly called *a Son*, which could not be if he were not bred in the Virgins womb. Epiph. hær. 31. Lu. 1. 31. 42.

2. *Apelles* and his Sect, ſaid, that *Chriſt made himſelf a Body of the Elements, and that he did not receive his Fleſh from the Virgin.* Epiph. hær. 44.

3. The *Manichees* ſaid, that *the fleſh and body of Chriſt, was not a true and real body and fleſh, but only a ſimilitude or ſhape thereof, and a meer Phanteſm.* They confeſſed him to be God, but denied that he was Man; contrary to the blaſphemy of the *Jews*, who knew him to be a Man, but would not confeſs or believe that he was God. Aug. epiſt. 74.

Pat. Symson cent. 16.

4. Some *Anabaptists* also in the former Century sprang up in *Germany*, who said, *That Christ took not his flesh and blood of the Virgin* Mary, *but brought them with him from Heaven.*

Joh. 3:13 & 6. 38.

Those *Anabaptists* fell into this Heresie, by misunderstanding some passages of Scripture, where it is said, *The Son of Man came down from Heaven*, and where Christ said of himself, *I came down from Heaven.* And where St. *Paul* said, *The Second Man is the Lord from Heaven.*

1 Cor. 15.47.

Apollinarius dixit carnem Christi ab æterno fuisse, & de cœlo descendisse. Soz. l. 6. c. 27.

But those sayings which are meant properly of the Godhead of the Son of Man, yet are also truly said of the whole Person of Christ, by an *Antidosis, or communication of Properties*, as Divines call it, which consisteth in this, That the two distinct Natures in Christ, *viz.* the Godhead, and the Manhood do both of them communicate their several properties each to other, by reason of the Union of those two distinct Natures, in that one Person of Christ.

Hence it is, that the Scripture so speaketh of the Person of Christ. *They crucified the Lord of Glory.* And, the blood of Christ is called *the Blood of God.* And, the *Jews* are said to have *crucified the Prince of Life.* And of the Thief, Christ said, *This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise,*

1 Cor. 2. 8 Acts 20. 28. Acts 3. 15 Luke 23. 43.

yet

yet Chriſt himſelf was not then in Paradiſe, as *Man*, but only as *God*. In the ſame ſenſe, the words of Chriſt above-mentioned are to be underſtood, *The Son of Man came from Heaven*, which is true, becauſe the ſame *Son of Man* was alſo the *Son of God*, and the only God, who indeed came down from Heaven.

Not only the Hereticks, but the Heathens alſo, depraved, and obſcured the Doctrine of Redemption, by affirming that Men at firſt ſprang out of Trees, or grew out of the Earth,

——*Rupto robore nati,* *Juvenal*
Compoſitique luto, nullos habuere parentes. *Sat. 6.*

And the *Jews* alſo ſaid that God made at firſt, *two Women for* Adam, although we find but one, and her taken out of the ſide of the firſt Man, *fleſh of his fleſh*; the other muſt have been otherwiſe made, whereupon the *Jews* feigned *Genealogies*, as derived from the womb of the ſecond Woman, which are thoſe Genealogies which St. *Paul* called *vain*, (as St. *Auſtin* thought) which Jewiſh fiction depraved the doctrine of our Union with Chriſt, and conſequently of *univerſal Redemption* of Mankind; becauſe that Work was limited, and confi-

Aug. To. 6. n. 16. 1 Tim. 1. 4.

ned

ned to the Seed of *Eve*, who was that *Woman, whose Seed should bruise the Serpents head*, who was the only Woman that was taken out of *Adams* side, and all Nations of men, with Christ also have proceeded from the loins and womb of that one Man, and that one Woman.

This necessary *Union* was intimated by the *Prophets*, and also by the Apostle, by the similitude of *earthen Vessels*, and of bread: *The Potter hath power over the clay, of the same lump to make one Vessel to honour, another to dishonour*; and St. *Paul* calleth our bodies *earthen Vessels*. Christ also, and his Members are resembled to Bread, in respect of their Union and communion one with the other. *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ, for we being many are one Bread, and one Body, for we are all partakers of that one Bread*: The *similitude* holds in this; that as many earthen Vessels are made out of one lump of clay; and many Breads or loaves, out of one dough or lump of Paste, wherein they were first united, before they were extracted and severally formed; just so, all Men in the world with Christ himself, were at first united in that one lump, or mass of the first Man, before they were extracted; of which Union St. *Paul* saith, that

Isa. 45. 9. Jer. 18. 6. Ro. 9. 21. 2 Cor. 4. 7.

1 Cor. 10. 16.

that *God hath made of one blood* (whatever blood signifieth) *all Nations of Men.* Acts 17. 26.

CHAP. VIII.

THe Eating of the flesh of Christ certainly signifieth, only the *Union of our flesh with his Flesh*, which *Union* was from Eternity designed by the Godhead, in his mercifull purpose towards Mankind, his future, and intended Creatures, as hath been before shewed.

But then if so, we are next to enquire, why it pleased our Redeemer to express, and declare this *Union*, by such seeming-harsh, and tragical Words, *of Eating his Flesh, and drinking his Blood*, which if literally and grosly understood, of *Oral eating and drinking* the flesh and blood of Man, are such things as all civilized People, both Christians and Heathens abhor, and those that have been observed so to do (as *Pliny* writeth of the ancient and rude *Scythians*) are branded with a character of barbarous savageness and inhumanity; as *Plutarch* and *Salust* noted of the *Catilinarian* conspirators, that they entred a wicked

Plin. hist. lib. 7. c. 2.

Plut. in vit. Cicer. Salust. de bel. Catil.

ed *Covenant* by a bloody ceremony of killing a man, and tasting of his flesh, and drinking of his blood mingled with Wine, and St. *Jerom* writeth, that himself saw barbarous People in *France* feeding on human flesh.

Hier. con. Jovin. l. 2. c. 5.

The Answer hereunto is, That our Saviour therefore chose this similitudinary way to express our Union with himself, because he would signifie a necessity of our most near conjunction with him, so as to be one flesh with his Flesh, in order to the Redemption of our bodies by his Body, which otherwise could not be, as is shewed before; for there cannot be a surer Union than such, as our food with us which unites it self, and grows into one bulk with our Bodies (as is before said) the whole stature and increase of our magnitude from our Nativity, our augmentation from one cubit at our Birth, to five cubits at our full and ripe Age, is wholly by our food, so that nothing is more ours than that: There was a truth in that Epitaph of the voluptuous King *Sardanapalus*, *Hæc habui quæ edi*, he accounting nothing to be his, but what he had eaten, for when all other worldly acquirements of *lands, wealth, treasures, and honours* at our death are utterly lost; that only, by which our Food is united

Cap. 2.

Plut. mor. Died. Sic.

nited with us shall be restored, and after the Resurrection will continue with us for ever, and must be accounted ours.

Like this union, is the Union of our flesh with the Flesh of Christ in the *first Man*, which is the ground of our *Redemption*, and of the *Resurrection* of our bodies, without which, neither could be more than the resurrection of brute beasts; for in the first Man was the general *Atonement* of mankind with Christ, both in flesh and in Soul, by which *Union*, Mankind is made capable of claiming the benefits of his Merits, and of the Passions of his blessed Body and Soul. Christ saith, *No man hath ascended into heaven but the Son of Man*, &c. upon which words St. *Austin* saith, *Si vis ascendere, esto in Christo; whosoever shall ascend into heaven, must necessarily be in Christ*, that is, *united with Christ*; for *except we so eat the Flesh of the Son of Man*, &c. *we have no life in us.* Joh. 3. 13 Aug. in loc. John 6.

This doctrine of *Union*, was represented and signified by Christ, in the Institution of his *Holy Supper*, by eating and drinking that sanctified Bread and Wine: That Sacrament is therefore called by St. *Cyprian*, *the Sacrament of Redemption*, and by St. *Austin*, *the Sacrament of Union*, and both the Scripture and the Church call it the Cap. 3.

Commu-

Communion, which word clearly signifieth the mutual Union of Christ and Mankind (as is before shewed) which the *Primitive Fathers* did so rightly apprehend, as may appear by a general usance, practised in those times in the office of the Sacrament.

In the Sacramental *Chalice*, the Fathers for many Ages tempered or mixed *water with the Wine*, although we find neither Precept, nor Precedent for it in the holy Scriptures; yet *de facto* it appeareth that so it was, by many evidences in the Fathers, as in *Justin* Martyr, *Cyprian*, *Ambrose*, *Chrysostom* and *Austin*; which Custome is to this day continued in many Places and Churches, and (by reason of the Antiquity thereof) it is pretended to be an Apostolical Tradition, and very early instituted as a *Canon* by *Alexander the first*, who was Bishop of *Rome* about the year of Christ 118. as *Platina* reports.

Cyp. l. 2. epist. 3. Of this Usance St. *Cyprian* renders this reason, and plausible account in an Epistle written to *Cæcilius*; in the sacred Chalice (saith he) the Water signifieth the People, and the Wine representeth Christ. *Vinum sine aqua, est Christus sine Populo; Aqua sine vino, est Populus sine Christo*; Wine alone may signifie Christ without his People, and water alone may signifie the People without Christ;

Chriſt; but both together ſo mingled in the Chalice, was to ſignifie that Chriſt, and his People were ſo *united*, *concorporated* and *entwined* one with the other, as the wine with the water; therefore Chriſt ſaid, *He that eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him*; which is as much as if he had ſaid, he that dwelleth in me, is he that Eateth my fleſh, which dwelling is mutual; for by this Union the fleſh of Chriſt dwelleth in us, and our fleſh in him. John 6.

There were a Sect of Hereticks called *Hydroparaſtatæ* or *Aquarii*, ſet up by one *Tatianus*, mentioned in *Theodoret*, who conſecrated water only in the Sacramental Chalice without Wine; and are therefore by St. *Auſtin* put into his Catalogue of Hereticks, under the title of *Aquarii*, becauſe water alone did not repreſent that mutual Union of Chriſt and his People, which the Church intended, as is before ſaid, by their mixture of Water with Wine. *Theod. hær. fab. lib. 1.* *Aug. T. 6. hær. 64.*

CHAP. IX.

THere were in the Primitive times ſome Hereticks, who thought thoſe words of

of Chriſt concerning the *eating his Fleſh, and drinking his Blood*, were to be underſtood groſly and literally, of *Oral eating*, juſt as the *Tranſubſtantiators* at this day pretend, and as formerly the Diſciples of *Capernaum* thought, when they asked, *how can this Man give us his fleſh to eat?* Upon which words St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *Diſcipuli ejus acceperunt id ſtultè, carnaliter cogitantes, quòd Dominus præſciſurus erat particulas de corpore ſuo, & eis daturus.* Thoſe Diſciples apprehended that ſpeech fooliſhly, and carnally, thinking that he would cut his Body in pieces and give it them.

Aug. in Pſal. 25.

The *Manichees* ſaid, that when men did eat fruits, or herbs, or other food, that then they did eat the parts or Members of God, mingled with thoſe creatures. As St. *Auſtin* reporteth of them.

Aug. cont. Fauſt. l. 23. c. 6.

The *Gnoſtick* Hereticks uſed for their *Myſteries* or Sacraments, to bruiſe the fleſh of a new-born Babe in a mortar, and to eat it with Honey and Pepper, and for this they pretended thoſe words of Chriſt, *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of Man*, &c. as *Epiphanius* reporteth.

Epiph. h. 7. 26. Hie. Epi. ad Marcel. n. 18. Epip. her. 48.

The *Montaniſts* alſo cruelly and impiouſly uſed to prick the veins of a ſucking Child, and with it to knead Meal, and of both to make their *Euchariſt*, as *Epiphanius* reporteth,

reporteth, and St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* nameth a *Montaniſt-Woman*, one *Midra*, who practiſed this cruelty in the *16th.* Catechiſm of Illuminates, if thoſe Catechiſmes be his. *Cyril. Catech. 16.*

Now let the prudent Reader conſider, whether the Doctrine of the *Tranſubſtantiators* be not grounded on the ſame miſunderſtood Principle, on which the above-named Hereticks founded their Errors and cruel practices, *viz.* on thoſe words of Chriſt, *Except ye eat the fleſh, and drink the blood of the Son of Man*, &c.

Theſe practices brought a great ſuſpicion, and raiſed ſcandalous reports upon the ancient Chriſtians, as *Epiphanius* obſerves; for, becauſe thoſe Hereticks, who did really in their Myſteries ſo do, as is ſaid, and called themſelves Chriſtians, therefore the *Jews* and the *Gentiles*, and Perſecutors thought that all true and Catholick Chriſtians did the ſame. *Salvianus* tells us, that the *Gentiles* ſaid, that Chriſtians in their Sacrifices committed *Homicide*. *Origen* ſaith, that the *Jews* accuſed Chriſtians to be eaters of *Humane fleſh*. *Tertullian* reports, that they were accuſed as *murtherers of Infants*. And *Athenagoras*, that they were charged with *Thyeſtian* Feaſts (*Thyeſtes* was maliciouſly trapan'd to the eating *Epiph. hær. 26. & 29.* *Salv. n. 6.* *Orig. n. 35* *Tert. Apol. n. 25* *Athenagoras n. 72. 75.*

of the fleſh of his own Children unawares.)

Minut. in Octavio n. 99. *Minutius Fœlix* confirmeth, that in his time Chriſtians generally were accuſed falſly, as Murtherers, and Eaters of the fleſh and blood, and members of Infants, mingled and wrought up with Meal.

Zuing. Sup. n. 11. In later times, *Huldericus Zuinglius* the younger, in his Supplement of the *Chronology of Pet. Pictavienſis*, reporteth of *Averroes* a great Philoſopher, and an Heathen, who lived about the year of Chriſt 1149. hearing of the Doctrine of real, and carnal Eating the very fleſh of Chriſt, as it was in his time taught by ſome Chriſtians (as now it is by Tranſubſtantiators) ſaid, that of all Religions that he had ſeen, he thought there was none worſe than Chriſtianity, becauſe Chriſtians, *Deum quem colunt devorant*, They profeſſed to eat him whom they worſhip, and acknowledge to be their God.

Summa eſt inſania adorare quod comeditur. Theod. in Gen. quæſt. 55.

To theſe calumnies and falſe aſperſions of Chriſtians, the Fathers and the above-named *Apologiſts*, have left us true, ſatisfactory, and undeniable Anſwers, by any man that is judicious, and unintereſted in the Heriſie of carnal Eating.

1. The Chriſtians affirmed that their very Accuſers confeſſed, that they never ſaw any ſuch thing done by any Catholick Chriſtian.

2. That

2. That the true Chriſtians ſuffered patiently ſtripes, wounds, torments, loſſes, yielding themſelves patiently to all injuries, and alſo in the midſt of their ſufferings prayed for their very Afflictors; therefore unlikely to be Manſlayers.

3. That they could not reaſonably be imagined to eat the fleſh and blood of Men, except they firſt killed thoſe that were ſo to be eaten; but Chriſtians were ſo far from either killing, or eating human Fleſh, which was unlawfull, that they abſtained from eating the fleſh of other Creatures which was lawfull.

4. That their Chriſtian Diſcipline, reſtrained them from being ſo much as but ſpectators only of the bloody conflicts of *Gladiators*, and even of the Baytings and ſlaughters of Beaſts, which uſually were preſented in the *Roman* Theaters by the *Roman* Emperours and Conſuls, and by other heathen Princes; nor might they go to ſee the Execution of men condemned to die.

5. That Chriſtians accounted thoſe Women guilty of Homicide, and liable to anſwer to God for murther, who uſed medicinal Drinks or Druggs to deſtroy Conceptions, or cauſe Abortions. Surely they would not murther Children born and perfect, who were carefull to preſerve unborn Conceptions.

6. That Chriſtians accounted thoſe to be *Infanticides* or Parricides, who did but only expoſe their own Infants.

7. That they who firmly believe a Reſurrection of their bodies, cannot reaſonably be thought to make thoſe bodies ſepulchres of other Bodies, by eating them, who alſo ſhall certainly ſo riſe again at the laſt day: Theſe, and many more Allegations, we find in the ancient Chriſtian-Writers to confute the ſlander of *Anthropophagy*.

The *Tranſubſtantiators* of our time, may upon more evident reaſons be charged juſtly with ſuch Accuſations, than the Primitive Chriſtians were, becauſe thoſe do not only acknowledge, but with all the cunning, and ſubtilties, and arguments that Mans wit and brain can invent, pertinaciouſly and obſtinately aſſert the real, carnal, corporal and Oral eating of the Body, and drinking the Blood of Man, even of the beſt Man that ever was, the *Man Jeſus*, whom they dare not deny to be to this day, and for ever to continue *Perfect Man*, as well as *Perfect God*; and more alſo they affirm, that in the Bleſſed Euchariſt they eat and drink, not only his Body and Blood, but alſo his Soul, and his very Godhead, although Chriſt had ſaid before to his *Jewiſh* Diſciples, that ſo to eat his Fleſh (as

then

then the *Capernaitans*, and our Tranſubſtantiators now apprehended thoſe words) profiteth nothing; And as to the Eating or drinking his Soul and Godhead, that is altogether impoſſible. Joh. 6. 63

St. *Auſtin* in his *Polemicks* againſt the *Marcionites*, conſidering thoſe words of Eating and Drinking the fleſh and blood of Chriſt, ſaith, *figuratè dictum*, that thoſe words are figurative. And *ſapienter intelligamus*, we are warily to underſtand them; for (ſaith he) *Horribilius videatur, humanum ſanguinem potare, quam fundere*, To drink Human blood ſeemeth to be more abhorred, than to ſpill it; for the ſame Father had written before, *Si Scriptura videtur flagitium, aut facinus jubere; figurata locutio eſt, ut niſi manducaveritis carnem Filii Hominis*, when the Scripture ſeemeth to command any heinous or miſchievous act, it is figuratively meant, as thoſe words are, *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man.* And in that Sermon *de Cœna*, which goes under the name of St. *Cyprian*, which was not his, but written about the Year 1150. not long before *Tranſubſtantiation* was firſt eſtabliſhed: Upon thoſe words, *Except ye Eat*, &c. it is ſaid, *If the fleſh of that Perſon were divided into pieces, it would not ſuffice all Mankind, it would be conſu-*

Aug. cont. Marc. l. 2. T. 6.

Id. de Doct. Chriſt. l. 3 c. 16. To. 3. 2. 55.

Cyp. de Cœn. 95

med, and with it our Religion would ceaſe. Therefore certainly that *Eating* which Chriſt ſpake of, is not to be underſtood of *Oral eating*, as may appear alſo by that which follows.

CHAP. X.

THe learned Reader may be pleaſed to obſerve with me, that thoſe words of Chriſt, *John 6. Except ye Eat*, being in the Original ἐαν μὴ φάγητε, are far otherwiſe read and rendred by all the Latin Fathers generally, than as they are now Tranſlated with us in *England*; for *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Hierome*, *Auſtin*, *Proſper*, and other Fathers thus read them. *Niſi manducaveritis*, which words ſignifie the time paſt, as if he had ſaid, *Except ye have eaten the fleſh of the Son of Man*; juſt ſo doth the Tranſlation of *Sixtus*, and *Clemens* render thoſe words, *Niſi manducaveritis*, and *biberitis*. So doth *Bellarmine*, and generally all the *Roman* Writers, and the *Lutheran* Writers, and *Calvin* and *Beza*; and ſo do the Tranſlators of the Greek Fathers, as of *Origen* and *Epiphanius*; indeed all, though they be of divers Perſuaſions in Religion, yet they agree in the ſaid rendring

Orig. in Levit. c. 10. n. 7.

dring of thoſe Words, and our own right Learned Grammarians conſent unto, and approve of this Reading; and St. *Auſtin* ſeems to intimate the ſame ſaying, *Crede, & manducaſti.* *Aug. in Joh. Tract. 25.*

From whence we may obſerve, that *Eating the Fleſh of Chriſt*, in their ſenſe, or by their Interpretation at leaſt, is not to be underſtood of any preſent *Oral Eating*, or if it were to be done only in the future, or in the preſent Euchariſt, or as if it were not already done; for the Eating here meant, is intended generally by all Mankind, and not only by *holy Men*, as *Prophets*, *Patriarchs*, *Apoſtles*, *Iſraelites or Chriſtians*; but alſo by *Infidels*, by *Pagans*, *Turks*, *Athieſts*, and the very worſt of all *Mankind*, by ſuch as never heard of Chriſt, and thoſe that never received the Sacrament of the Body of Chriſt, or ſo much as once heard of it, and moreover by ſuch as deſpiſed it; nor is *Cain* or *Judas* (the worſt of both Teſtaments) excluded from this Eating of the fleſh of Chriſt, ſo as it here ſignifieth, becauſe they were redeemed by him.

My reaſon for this Aſſertion is, becauſe I firmly believe, that this *Eating* ſignifieth only the *Union* of the bodies of all Men in the World, with the body of Chriſt, in

that one original Lump of *Adam*, wherein the worst of Men have their Interest and Participation, as truly and really as the greatest Saints on Earth; for the Son of God by his Incarnation, assumed Human flesh, which was the same, not only with the flesh which holy Men derived from the loyns of *Adam*, but with that Flesh which Unholy, and generally all Men received thence. All *Adamites* of what condition soever, do communicate in the Incarnation of Christ; nor is there any Man whose flesh Christ hath not assumed, and with whose flesh the Flesh of Christ is not united; because the benefit of his Incarnation, was to be tendered to all the Progeny of *Adam*, that is, to the *whole Adam*, which is all Mankind, and only to them; from which benefit and all the consequences thereof, the *Apostate Angels* are utterly excluded, because (as the *Apostle* saith) *He took not on him the Nature of Angels, but he took on him the Seed of Abraham*, and therefore he took on him the Seed of *Adam*, in whose loyns both *Abraham*, and Christ, and all Mankind were united (as before is shewed.)

Heb. 2. 16.

The time when Man doth thus *Eat the flesh of the Son of Man*, that is, when our flesh is united with the Flesh of Christ, is at our *Conception* in the Womb; for then

we

we at firſt *concarnate* with Chriſt, and then we firſt communicate in the ſame Fleſh which Chriſt, and we, by propagation have derived from the firſt Man; Hence it is, that *David* the Type of Chriſt, ſaid of the Men of *Juda*, *Ye are my Brethren, my bones and my fleſh*, which was true, only becauſe *David*, and that Tribe were united in the loyns of the *Patriark Juda*: Juſt ſo the Apoſtle ſaith of the *Epheſians*, and of himſelf, *We are Members of his body, of his fleſh, and of his bones*, which cannot otherwiſe appear to be true, but only by the Union of their bodies with the Body of Chriſt, in the loyns of the firſt Man; for we, nor they did deſcend from the Body of Chriſt, nor were we ever in his loyns, yet he calls us *his Brethren*, becauſe we with him have one Father in the fleſh, that is, *Adam*, whoſe Sons we all are, and ſo is Chriſt, who is therefore called *the laſt Adam*, which is the name of his Father, other Men are alſo called by the names of their earthly Fathers; as *Auſtin* ſaith of all Men, *Omnis homo terrenus eſt Adam*, every man on earth is *Adam*; and *Caſſander* in his Book *de duabus Naturis in Chriſto*, very truly obſerveth, *Chriſtus juxta carnem, eſt conſubſtantialis univerſo humano generi*, Chriſt according to the fleſh, is conſubſtantial with all Mankind,

2 Sam. 19.12.

Eph. 5.30

Matth. 25.40.

1 Cor. 15.45.

Aug. Retract. l. 1. c. 15.

Caſſander Pag. 47.

There

There are yet some few Questions to be examined and discussed, in this weighty Mystery concerning the *Union* of our flesh with the flesh of Christ, which is here signified by *Eating*, of which we are next to enquire.

CHAP. XI.

IT being granted, that our flesh and the Flesh of Christ are so united or entwined, and mingled one with the other, as is said; it may be enquired what vertue, or efficacy hath the Flesh of Christ, more than the flesh of the *Patriarks*, *Prophets and Apostles*? with whom we are as really united in the first Man, as we are with Christ; for we know that the flesh of Christ is a Creature, and so is the flesh of those who all descended from *Adam*, as Christ did.

To this Query we answer and grant, that the flesh, or body of Christ was, and
Phil. 2. 7. still is a Creature, for *he took upon him the form of a Servant*, a servant must needs be a Creature, and every creature is a servant to the Godhead, only the Godhead is neither a creature, nor a servant; therefore the flesh of Christ being considered alone,

and

and only by it self being a Creature, doth not enoble Christ, nor entitle him higher, than to be stiled only *the Son of Man*, the Son of the Virgin *Mary*, and of *David*, of *Abraham*, and of *Adam*.

But withall we are to consider, that this *Son of Man*, and this *form of a Servant*, was personally united with the *Son of God*, and with the *Form of God*, the flesh of Christ was the flesh of *God the Word*, of which it is said, *the Word was made Flesh*, and *the Word was God*, therefore Christ is called *God manifested in the flesh*, and of him it is said, that *God sent his Son in the likeness of sinfull Flesh*. The flesh which the Son of God assumed, was true and real Flesh, yet not sinfull flesh, but only in similitude, *viz.* like to the flesh of other Men which is sinfull: This Son of God by Incarnation, being made the Son of Man, is called *Emanuel*, and this because he is God, personally united with Man, and is *Theanthropos*, and though he is very Man, yet he is also very God, and is therefore by the same Prophet called *the Mighty God*, *and the Everlasting Father*.

John 1. 1. 14. 1 Tim. 3. 16. Rom. 8. 3. Isa. 7. 14. 9. 6.

True it is that the flesh of Christ is a Creature, but not singly, and soly, and only *a meer Creature*, but such a Creature as was always united, and personally joyned with the

the Creator; for the flesh of Christ never was consisting, or existing alone without his Godhead, his Humanity was ever united with his Divinity. The good Rule of Divines is, *Humana natura in Christo, non est Persona appellanda, quia non subsistit per se*, there never was any minute of time since the first Conception of Christ, wherein his flesh, body or Manhood was alone disjoyned, or seperated from his Godhead; therefore the single human Nature of Christ may not be called a Person. *Cassander* saith very truly, *Non primùm natus est Homo communis de Virgine, & demum post habitavit in eo Verbum, sed in ipso utero Virginali, secum Carnem conjunxit*, We are not to think that Christ was first born a common Man, and that afterwards, God the Word united himself with his flesh, for that was done in the Virgins Womb, his Flesh was never existing alone, but ever was the Flesh of God, his Body always was *Corpus Dei*, the Body of God, as the Scripture calls his Blood, *the Blood of God*, Acts 20. 28. And his Death, *the Death of God*, as St. *John* saith, *Hereby we perceive the love of God, because he hath laid down his life for us.* The laying down of the life of Christ, is called the laying down the life of God.

Cass. n. 1. *Fol.* 11.

Cass fol. 32.

Acts 20. 28. 1 John 3. 16.

The vertue and efficacy of the Flesh of

the

the *Son of Man*, and that which makes his fleſh ſo benificial to Mankind, conſiſteth in this *Union*, viz. Becauſe his Fleſh is joyned, and perſonally united with the *Word* or *Son of God*; for his Fleſh, if it were nothing elſe but only fleſh, it could not profit us, as Chriſt ſaid, *the Fleſh profiteth nothing*; for it is the Union of his Divine Spirit with his Fleſh, that maketh his fleſh *Vivifical or Quickening*, as Chriſt ſaid, *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing, the Words that I ſpeak, they are Spirit, and they are Life*; the meaning is, that the whole efficacy of his Fleſh conſiſteth only, in and by the conjunction of his Divine Spirit with it, who is not only *Vivifical*, but alſo *Life* it ſelf, therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, *the laſt Adam was made a quickning Spirit.* The laſt *Adam* ſignifies Chriſt, who is called *Adam*, only becauſe his Human nature was derived from *Adam*, which human Nature was made *Vivifical*, by being united with *the Divine quickning Spirit*, and becauſe this laſt *Adam*, and the Divine Spirit or Godhead, were perſonally united in Chriſt; therefore he ſaith of him, *The Second Man is the Lord from Heaven.* The fleſh of Chriſt thus being ſweetned by his Divine Spirit, is like that *Leaven* mentioned in the Goſpel, wherewith the whole lump of

Joh. 6. 63

1 Cor. 15. 45.

Verſ. 47.

Mat. 13. 33.

of Mankind is ſeaſoned; the efficacy, pow-
er, and operation whereof may more eaſily
be apprehended by this ſimilitude.

As *wood*, or a dead *coal*, or *iron* do no
of themſelves alone burn, or heat a man
but if they be joyned with fire, and made
red hot thereby, they will heat and burn.
The fleſh of the *Son of Man* alone, is like
the wood and iron, and the Divine Spirit
united with the fleſh, is like the fire (as it
Acts 2. once appeared in *Cloven tongues, like as of*
fire) by which Spirit only, the fleſh is acti-
ated, and made operative, hence proceed
thoſe effects, and productions mentioned in
the Goſpel, where Chriſt ſaid, *I am the*
John 6. *Bread which came down from Heaven, and*
33,41,51 *giveth life to the World*; we know that only
his Divine Spirit came from Heaven, not his
fleſh, of which effects we ſhall ſay more in
their due place.

CHAP. XII.

ANother Queſtion to be diſputed con-
cerning the *Modus*, the way, or man-
ner of this myſterious Eating, is, how Men
can be truly ſaid to eat the Fleſh of Chriſt?
And this, becauſe thoſe that diſavow, and
abhor

abhor the Dream of *Transubstantiators* of a gross, carnal, and Oral eating, have conceived another way, which they call *Eating Spiritually*; which word is used in this question by the Church of *England*, declaring to the penitent and faithfull Communicants, that *They Spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood, They dwell in Christ, and Christ in them, They be One with Christ, and Christ with them*, which is true.

By those words of *Dwelling in Christ, and being One with him, and Eating his Flesh*, this Church declareth.

1. First, a true and real Union of our flesh with his very Flesh, although she utterly denieth the gross and Oral eating, and tearing of his Flesh.

2. Secondly, she declareth by the word *Spiritually*; That this Eating is to be understood only *Mystically* or *Spiritually*, and not carnally or Orally; for Oral eating is only of the *Sacrament*, but not of the very real Substance, which is signified by that Sacrament. So we are now to enquire, what is meant by the Eating the flesh of Christ spiritually.

To this we Answer, That this word *Spiritually* hath a double signification, for

1. *First*. It is by many Learned Men thought to signifie, only the Receiving the Spirit *D. Ushers Serm. ad Parl. 1630.*

Spirit of our Lord Jesus, by which we are united with him; because the same Spirit which is in Jesus, is from him the Head derived, and communicated to his Members. Of this Union of the Spirit, or spiritual Union of us with Christ, the great Apostle often speaketh, *He that is joyned to the Lord is one Spirit*; and, *By one Spirit ye are all baptized into one Body*; and, *There is one Body and one Spirit*. By vertue of this one Spirit so communicated, the whole multitude of the Church, or Members of Christ, are accounted but one Mystical Body.

1 Cor. 6. 17. 12. 13. Eph. 4. 4.

But this *Spiritual Union*, or Union in Spirit, although it is true and real, yet this alone may not be thought to be so plenary, or so sufficient an Union, as is necessarily required for expediting that great Work, for which the Blessed Godhead designed Man Union with Christ, as may appear by the Reasons following.

1. *First.* If to eat *Spiritually*, should signifie to receive the Spirit of Christ only, and no more, and be only so by us apprehended, utterly disowning the eating, or the real Union of his Flesh with our flesh, in truth and reality; we shall thereby disturb and null the Order of the grand, and merciful work of Redemption, which could not be wrought, only by an union or conjunction

of the Spirit of the Son of God with us, but also with the Union of his blessed Flesh and Blood with our flesh and blood, because the Spirit alone is not a Redeemer; for the Spirit could not suffer, and die for us as a Redeemer must, it was the vital blood and death of the Redeemer, that was necessarily required for Mans Redemption.

2. *Secondly.* The *Son of God* (as only so) was a Spirit from Eternity (for God is a Spirit.) But if the Son of God will vouchsafe to become a Redeemer, he must needs be first *the Son of Man*, and *Emanuel*, as the Church in her Hymn confesseth, *When thou tookest upon thee to deliver Man, thou didst not abhorr the Virgins Womb.*

For if *God the Son*, or God the Word, had so continued in his pure Divinity, and had not assumed our Human nature, so as to be the *Son of Man*, and *the Word made Flesh*, he could not have been *Christ*, nor *Jesus*, nor *Priest*, nor *Sacrifice*, nor *Redeemer*; for otherwise, we might as well say, that the Person of the Father, or the Person of the *Holy Ghost* were our Redeemers, although neither of those Persons assumed our nature, as *Austin*, or rather *Gennadius* observed, *Nec Pater, nec Spiritus assumpsit carnem,* *Aug. T. 3. n. 71.*

nem, sed Filius tantùm. So all Divines will assent to this Theological Axiom, *Divina natura non est Redemptrix, quia pati non potuit*, the pure and single Divine nature could not be the Redeemer, because it could not suffer or die. And we know that Redemption was confined and limited, so as to be only by the *Seed of the Woman*; but the Spirit, or Holy Ghost is not the Seed of the Woman, therefore *God the Son* took on him that Seed, and that form of a Servant, and therein he became our Redeemer, because thereby he became Mortal, and could suffer and die.

Cassander Vol. 30.

Neither could the human Nature of Christ, considered singly and alone, without his Divine Nature, and by it self only have redeemed us, because no meer Creature could possibly be of sufficient worth to ransom the World, or to satisfie Divine Justice for the sins of Mankind.

3. A third Reason is, That other Creatures (besides Mankind) have the Spirit of God (which is the same Spirit with the Spirit of Christ) yet those other creatures have no benefit by the Incarnation and Passion of Christ. For the blessed Angels are plentifully endowed with the Spirit, yet because they are not united with the flesh and blood of Christ, they cannot be capable

pable of any benefit thereby, or of Redemption (if need were) more than the evil, or Apoſtate Angels are; becauſe the Son of God dit not *aſſume the nature of Angels*, nor did any Angels aſſume the nature of Man. Heb. 2. 16. Beſides, other inferiour Creatures are not deſtitute of the Spirit of God, which is ſaid to *fill Heaven and Earth.* The Pſalmiſt could not tell, *whether he ſhould go from the Spirit*, and God by his Prophet had ſaid, *I will pour out my Spirit upon all fleſh*, which is truly performed, not only on Mankind, but alſo on other inferiour Creatures; for by the vertue and vigour of the Spirit, *they live, and move, and have their being*; yet they are not thereby capable of the benefits or effects which come by the Incarnation, becauſe they are not ſo united with Chriſt as our Nature is. For theſe reaſons I conceive it may appear, that the Eating, or the Union with the Fleſh of Chriſt, is not meant of Receiving only the Spirit, or of eating his Fleſh ſpiritually, in that ſenſe which is aboveſaid. Jer. 23. 24. Pſ. 139. 6 Joel 2. 28 Acts 17. 28.

2. *Secondly.* Thoſe words of *Eating ſpiritually*, in the ſenſe of the Church I conceive to ſignifie ſuch a kind of Eating, as is diſtinct and different from the literal or Grammatical ſignification thereof, and from any groſs, carnal or Oral eating; and that

it ſignifieth to Eat according to the Spirit, that is, according to the intent, purpoſe and true inward meaning and ſenſe of the Spirit. For we know that the word *Spirit*, in Scripture is often oppoſed to the word *Letter*, as may appear by thoſe words of St. *Paul*, 2 Cor. 3. 6. *God hath made us able Miniſters of the New Teſtament, not of the Letter, but of the Spirit.* Upon which words St. *Athanaſius* *Athan. To. 3 n. 26* thus writeth to *Serapion*, *Vos ſi ſacras literas evolveritis, invenietis Spiritus vocabulum in hoc uſurpari, ut mentem verborum ſignificet*, If you will peruſe the Holy Scriptures, you will find that the word *Spirit* is uſed to ſignifie the Mind, or meaning. Now the ſpirit, mind or meaning of thoſe words, is to be *really united with Chriſt*, yet without any Oral manducation literally taken. The Pſalmiſt ſaith, Pſal. 62. 11. *God hath ſpoken once, twice have I heard this*, *Duo hæc audivi*, that is, ſaith *Iſychius*, *Iſych. in Levit.* that he conſidered not only the *Letter*, but alſo the *Spirit*, or meaning of the words; for the Letter is but *folium Spiritus*, as the ſame Father ſaith, like to the leaf which covereth the fruit, or like unto the Vail, wherewith the ſhining face of *Moſes* was ſhadowed, or as the ſhell is to the kernel. *Origen*, in his Tractates upon *Orig. Tract. 3. & 26.* St. *Matthew*, calls the Letter *ſepulchrum Prophetarum*, like a ſepulcher in which the prophetical

phetical Mysteries are hid, but the signification and meaning of the *Letter* is (saith he) *Regalis, & dignior intellectus*, which he calls *animam & spiritum Literæ*, the more noble, and more worthy understanding of the Prophetical Writings, and the very life and *spirit* of them.

In the *Levitical* Law those Creatures are accounted *clean*, which *divided the hoof, and chewed the Cud*, which in the *Spirit* or meaning, signified those Persons, who in their Meditations on Scriptural Figures, did distinguish or divide the outward *Letter*, from the inward *Spirit* or meaning thereof. And St. *Austin* was bold to say, *Quædam quasi absurda miscet Spiritus sanctus, ut ex eo quod non possumus accipere ad literam, cogat nos spiritualiter quærere*, It hath pleased the Holy Ghost to mingle some passages with his Word, which seems uncomely and absurd, that thereby he might compell us to search out the *Spirit*, or meaning of that, which we cannot conceive fit or true according to the bare *Letter*. As, *If thy right eye offend thee*, &c. or *If thy right hand offend thee*, &c. The great Oratour observeth, *Scriptum sequi Calumniatoris est, boni judicis voluntatem scriptoris*, He is but a Wrangler, who urgeth only the bare letter of a Writing, but a good Judge will

Lev. 11. 3

Aug. in Ps. 103.

Mat. 5.

Tul. pro Cæcina N. 14.

conſider the will and meaning of the Writer. So ſay we, that becauſe to eat the fleſh of Chriſt literally taken, is impoſſible, and unprofitable, and undecent, therefore we deny that way, and acknowledge the other way of Eating *ſpiritually*, which (according to the intent, Spirit and meaning of Chriſt) ſignifieth the real *Union* of us with him, both in fleſh and ſoul, ſo as is above ſhewed, and will be more hereafter.

CHAP. XIII.

THere are others that think, that the Eating and Drinking the fleſh and blood of Chriſt, is by *Believing* in him, which they call *Eating by Faith*, without any conſideration of any other *Union* with his Fleſh and Blood: But theſe men do not rightly weigh and ponder the order and method, which our moſt wiſe, moſt juſt, and moſt merciſull God deſigned for the acquitment of lapſed Mankind, that their Redemption might be wrought, not only by his Mercy, but alſo with a ſtrict obſervance of exact Juſtice, which could not be performed without an Union of the Redeemer, and the Redeemed, as is before ſhewed.

This

This Union (which Chriſt called Eating) is not performed only by Faith or Believing, for the *Bleſſed Angels* believe, yet cannot be ſaid to *eat his Fleſh*, or to be united ſo with him, as is here required; even the *Apoſtate Angels* do alſo believe every Article of the Chriſtian Faith, and this upon more certainty and evidence, than many good Chriſtians have knowledge of, and with their believing they *tremble*, and although they believe as we do, yet they have not ſo eaten, nor are ſo united with Chriſt, as Mankind is: I may truly ſay of Angels, *Credunt, ſed non edunt*; becauſe they are not ſo united, they are utterly uncapable of the benefit of Chriſts Incarnation, and therefore of Redemption by him.

There have been, and ſtill are many Millions of People in the World, who never believed the Chriſtian Faith, as *Pagan-Infidels* and *Jews*, and ſuch as are above-mentioned, and many barbarous and uncivilized People, that ſtill *ſit in darkneſs, and in the ſhadow of death*, who never ſo much as heard of Chriſt. Yet all theſe, being the race and poſterity of *Adam*, have every one ſo eaten the fleſh of the Son of Man, as is here meant, that is, they are united with the fleſh of Chriſt in the loyns of the firſt Man; Cap. 10.

Redemption is as broad as Humane nature, *Biſh. Bedels Letter pa. 26.*

Man; which Union was actuated at their conceptions, in the Wombs of their mothers, although they never were, or perhaps never will be Believers; of all such I may say, *Edunt, sed non credunt*; therefore this Eating cannot be meant only of Believing.

Aug. in Joh. St. *Austin* in his 25. *Tractate on St. John*, writing upon those words in the 6. Chap-
Joh. 6. 29 ter, *This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent*; saith, *Quid paras dentes & ventrem? crede, & manducasti, Why preparest thou thy teeth, and thy stomach? believe, and thou hast eaten*; by which passage, some have thought that St. *Austin* meant, that *Believing* was the only way of Eating the flesh of Christ.

But the contrary is proved before, and if St. *Austin* were of that Opinion, he is not to be followed therein; yet I am confident that he did not so mean, because I find that this learned Father, hath divers times otherwise expounded those words, which mention the Eating and Drinking the flesh and blood of Christ to be meant of our Incorcorporation in him, which must signifie the union of our flesh with his Flesh; for so he
Aug. lib. 3. con Pelagian. c. 4. to. 7. n. 19. saith of those words, *John 6. Nisi manducaveritis carnem, nemo potest vitam æternam habere nisi incorporetur Christo*, No man can have

have Eternal life except he be incorporated in Chriſt. And in another place he bringeth in Chriſt ſaying, *Qui venit ad me, incorporatur mihi*, he that cometh to me, is incorporated in me. Again he ſaith, *Manducare illam eſcam, eſt manere in Chriſto, & Chriſtum manentem in ſe habere*, to eat that Food is to abide in Chriſt, and to have Chriſt abiding in him. And in the ſame Tractate, he thus ſheweth the union or conjunction of Chriſts Fleſh with our fleſh; *Siquis liquefactæ ceræ*, &c. If a man ſhall melt wax, and then put other melted wax into it, he wholly mingleth the one with the other. Juſt ſo is it with the fleſh of Chriſt and our fleſh, whereby it comes to be truly ſaid by Chriſt, *He that eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him*; for certainly, that God the Creator might effect this Union of Mankind with the Redeemer, he extracted all out of one, as *Proſp.* very judiciouſly obſerveth; *Deus ex uno fecit omnes, ut in Chriſti corpus venirent*, God made men (Chriſt and all) out of one *Adam*, that all Men might come into the Body of Chriſt.

Id. in Joh. Tract. 25. *Ibid. Tract. 27.* *Id. ibid.* Joh. 6 56 *Proſp. de Prov. n. 39.*

If now it be granted, that St. *Auſtin* did intend thoſe words to ſignifie ſo as is above ſaid; then they will amount no farther than this which to me ſeemeth a true gloſs, and

as

as much as if he had said, think it not needfull to prepare thy mouth to eat the Flesh of Christ, for, *Crede & manducasti*, thou hast so eaten his Flesh already, as he meant, by being united with him in the very Conception: only *believe in him*, and thereby that *Eating* or *Union* shall be profitable for thee, and not otherwise; because the Union or *Concarnation* of our flesh with his, without Faith cannot reach so far as to Salvation, for the very worst of men (as is said before) are united in flesh, with the Flesh of Christ.

The Wisdom of the Godhead, with *Justice and Mercy* designed this our Union with the flesh of *God the Son*, on purpose to qualifie and prepare our *foreseen lapsed Nature*, so, as by this way to put Mankind into a condition, and capacity of Redeemableness, and so of Salvation possibly, which could not otherwise be consistent with *Divine Justice*; as neither could it become his *Mercy* to have created Mankind, on purpose to torment us for ever in Hell. Our perdition is not from him, but from our selves, for he *would not the death of a sinner*; therefore hath he set us into this way, and possibility of Life.

Ezek. 18.32.

For the Nature of Mankind hath been in three several conditions, which Divine expres

expres's by these three words. 1. *Natura Instituta.* 2. *Natura Destituta.* 3. *Natura Restituta.* By which they mean the state of Innocency, the state of our Fall, and the state of our Recovery by Christ.

The first was, whilst our first Parents (who were created pure and holy) continued in that Original Integrity without sin.

The second was after their Fall or Sin, by which they became destitute, and were deprived of their prime Graces and Purity, and we by them.

The third condition, is our restitution to Grace and Pardonableness by Christ, who being *the Son of God*, to effect this Restitution, became *the Son of Man*, by assuming the same Nature which we have; and in that Nature perfectly performed that Law of God (which was imposed upon us) in our behalf, and for us, and moreover bare in his own Body the punishments due for the sins of our lapsed Nature.

All the wisdom of Men and Angels could not find out a way, whereby lapsed Mankind could with justice be restored; but the mercifull Godhead effected it by *God the Son*, to become *Emanuel*; this was *the Lords doing* only.

Or if any creature had known, or discovered,

vered the same means; what Man or Angel, or Archangel, durst presume to have suggested it to the Godhead, so as to say, Thou O God hast imposed a Law on man, which Mankind by all its own power (being lapsed) cannot possibly perform. And thou hast threatned death for transgression thereof, which no Man possibly by himself can escape; therefore do thou O God, thine own self perform thine own Law, and to this end abase thy self, and assume man Nature on thee, and suffer the punishment due to Man; for otherwise, the whole Generation of Mankind must perish everlasting. How unlikely, or rather impossible would this suggestion seem to any Creature ever to take effect?

Yet the mercifull Godhead in great power and wisdom, did just so perform that great Work. Well might St. *Paul* say, *We preach Christ crucified, the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God*; Christ signifieth God, yet not only his pure Godhead, but as God is Incarnate, and made Man. The Wisdom of his Godhead appointed this way of ransoming the whole World from death, by the death of *one Man*; and the Power of his Godhead enabled and impowred *one Man* to perform that Work with full satisfaction to Divine Justice. When Christ had mira-

1 Cor. 1. 23, 24.

miraculously cured a *Paralitick*; St. *Matthew* tells us, that *the multitude glorified God, which had given such power unto Men*; and we for weightier reasons, shall be ever obliged to say, Glory, and honour, and thanks be to the *Son of God*, for so enabling and impowering the *Son of Man*. Mat. 9 8.

Thus far we have proceeded in shewing the *Modus* or way, which we conceive of the Eating the flesh of Christ; If this Exposition be approved (which is easily understood) it will quit us from the multitude of *impossibilities*, and the *Labyrinth* of subtilties and intricacies, wherein that other way of *Transubstantiation* hath entangled many Learned men; for mine own part I am persuaded, that if this way (which I have here described) be slighted, we shall never by any other way attain to any certain, or but probable understanding of this Mystery.

In the next place (by Gods assistance) we will endeavour to discover the other part, and more difficult Mystery, which is called *the Drinking of the Blood of Christ*.

My whole Design (Good Reader) in the former Chapters of this Book, was to shew and prove *the Union* of our flesh or body, with the Flesh or Body of Christ, as being

being necessary to the Redemption of our bodies by his Body.

In the following Chapters, I am to shew the Union of our souls with his Soul, to be altogether as necessary to the Redemption of our souls by his Soul; which that I may perform truly and plainly, I humbly implore the Divine, and Illuminating assistance of the Spirit of our Lord Jesus, our Blessed Redeemer.

CHAP. XIV.

The Blood of Christ.

The Words of Christ, which concern and import the *Drinking of his Blood*, are meant, and are to be understood in like manner, as we said of *Eating his Flesh*, for both those expressions signifie only the *Union* of our flesh and blood with the Flesh and Blood of Christ, or with that, which is by him called his *Blood*. John 6.

For the word *Blood*, hath a more high and noble signification in that speech of Christ, than the outward and literal sound expresseth; for to drink his Blood, literally and grosly understood, is as impossible

as

as unprofitable for us, as hath been before shewed of the Oral eating of his Flesh.

Besides, if we will suppose it possible, whilest he conversed with Men on Earth, or at the time of his death, & the real shedding of his Blood; we say that in that time the eating or drinking of Blood was forbidden by God in the *Jewish* Law, and afterwards by the Apostles in the Gospel; therefore certainly in those words of Christ, some other thing is meant by *Blood*, which literall and properly is not *very Blood*. The blessed Virgin *Mary*, and *Mary Cleophas*, and *Mary Magdalen*, and St. *John the Evangelist*, stood by the Cross when Christ was crucified, and although his Blood trickled down from his Hands, and Feet, and Side, yet there was no care taken by any of those holy and zealous Persons to catch, or preserve his Blood in any vessel, for any present or future use, which would not have been so carelesly neglected, if the Oral and literal Drinking thereof had been profitable or usefull; therefore surely there is some other mystical meaning of *Drinking his Blood*. Mr. *Fox* reporteth, that one *Johannes de Mountziger* wrote, that Christ at his Resurrection resumed to himself all the Blood which he had shed in his Passion, the Writer (it seems) thought that the

Lev. 17. Acts 15.

John 19.

Act. & Mon. sub Edw. 3. *a.* 38.

the ſtock of his Blood needed to be carefully husbanded, for if at this day his Blood were literally, and orally to be received by Communicants, how many Tunn of blood would be ſufficient to Communicate the whole Chriſtian World? But the word *Drink*, and the word *Blood* ſignifie ſomething elſe, and not as they ſound, as is next to be ſhewed.

Of the word Drink.

We know that this Word hath other ſignifications in the Holy Scriptures, beſides oral Drinking, for Chriſt himſelf, when
Joh. 7. 37 he ſaid, *If any man thirſt, let him come to me and drink*, he did not mean or intend it of any oral Drinking, as the ſame Evangeliſt immediately thus declareth, ſaying, *This*
39. *he ſpake of the Spirit, which they that believe on him ſhould receive*; Surely no Beleever can orally Drink the Spirit or Holy Ghoſt. So when Chriſt was apprehended by the Souldiers, and St. *Peter* attempted to reſcue him; Chriſt declared that he would
John 18. 11. not be reſcued, ſaying, *The cup which my Father giveth me, ſhall I not drink it?* This cup, and this drinking he meant of his Paſſions; and that ſpeech alſo, when he
Matth. 26. 39. prayed, ſaying, *O my Father, if it be poſſible, let*

let this cup pass from me; and when he foretold some of his Disciples, that *they should drink of the same cup that he drank of*, he meant it of his own, and of their Passions; we read of *drinking Iniquity*, and of *drinking the wrath of the Almighty*. The old *Greek* Poet *Anacreon* phansied, that *the Sun drinketh the Sea*, and that the *Moon drinketh the Sun*. The Sun and Moon properly do not drink, neither are Iniquity, wrath of God, persecutions and passions, such things as Men can properly be said to drink Orally; therefore surely these speeches are but figurative, and by them we are to understand some other way of Drinking, which is not Oral.

Mat. 20.22. Job 15,16. 21.20. Πίνει ὁ ἥλιος τὴν θάλασσαν τὸν δ' ἥλιον σελήνη.

Of the word Blood.

Neither is the word *Blood*, in that speech of Christ, to be taken or understood properly and literally, according to the meer Grammatical signification thereof, as if Christ had intended that Men should drink his very Blood: this could not be his meaning, as may appear by these Reasons following.

First, Because (as is beforesaid) Blood was forbidden in the Old Testament, *Flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof*, Gen. 9.4.

ye shall not eat; this inhibition was by God, afterwards by *Moses*, being directed by God, *He that eateth any manner of Blood,* Lev. 17.10. *I will cut him off from among his People* This *Judaical* and Ceremonial Law, was in force at that time, when Christ spake those words.

Secondly, Because Blood was forbidden in the New Testament, by that holy and unerring Council of the Apostles, assisted by the Spirit of their Master Jesus, *It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and us, that ye* Acts 15, 28. *abstain from Blood.* This Decree was directed to the *Gentiles*, for the *Jews* were then, and before zealous enough in abstaining from Blood, by vertue of the old Law; and the Christian *Gentiles* by vertue of this Apostolical Decree, did absolutely forbear Blood for some Ages of the Church, and it became one of the common Disciplines of Christians, and was so esteemed in the days of *Tertullian*, and after him.

Thirdly, It being granted that the Christians upon this reason did abstain from the blood even of beasts (which is true, and easily proved) how can it be imagined, that they should eat or drink the blood of Man, or (which is less credible) the Blood of that Man, whom they believed, and knew to be their most High, and only Lord God. Fourthly,

Fourthly, If it were possible for us Men now to drink the very Blood of Christ, orally and literally understood, it could not in the least advantage us in order to our Redemption, because it was not the meer Blood of Christ literally taken; that was the price of our Redemption (although one drop of his precious Blood was worth more than the whole World) for he shed his Blood at his *Circumcision*, but that Blood was not Redemptive; suppose he had *opened a vein*, and presented or offered that Blood, yet this could not have redeemed us; neither could that Blood, which issued out of his Body in *Agony* and *bloody Sweat*; or at his *Scourging* or *Crowning with thorns*; or that at the *piercing of his Hands and Feet*; all these Bloodsheddings together could not redeem Mankind, but the Blood of Christ, which was really redemptive, was his *Vital Blood*, whereof the words of St. *Peter* are rightly to be understood: *Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb*; and St. *John* declareth that it was of a Lamb, considered as a *Lamb slain*, and we know that the *Paschal Lamb slain*, was the Type or figure thereof. 1 Pet. 1. 18. Rev. 13. 8.

It was not then his meer Blood-shedding

that redeemed us, but it was the pouring out of his Life and Soul, that was the ultimate act and consummation thereof, of which all the four Evangelists have carefully informed us. St. *Matthew*, St. *Mark*, St. *Luke*, after the narration of all his grievous Sufferings, adds this as the principal, and most concerning and beneficial to us, that *he gave up the Ghost*, for Christ himself had said before, *The good Shepherd layeth down his life for the Sheep*; and, *Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life*; for the Redeemer was engaged, not only to perform the Law actively in his life time, but also passively, by his death to undergo the penalty due to the Transgressors of the prime *Original* Law, which was, *In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die*. The great Apostle often mindeth us of this great Truth, saying, *We are reconciled to God by the Death of his Son*; and *Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died*; and, *He became obedient to death*. And for our remembrance and acknowledgment thereof, the holy Sacrament was set up, as the same Apostle saith, *Ye shew the Lords death till he come*, and Christ had before declared, *Greater love than this hath no Man, than to lay down his Life for his friend*; surely his own love was the greatest love.

John 10.11,17

Gen. 2. 17.

Ro. 5 10. 8. 34. Phil. 2, 8.

1 Cor. 11.26.

John 15.13.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

THE Law of abſtaining from Blood was enacted by God, in a typical reference to the Blood of Chriſt, which was to be ſhed in after times upon the altar of the Croſs, for Expiation of the ſins of Mankind, which Expiation was (before the death of Chriſt) typically repreſented by the death and blood of *certain Creatures* appointed by God, whereby the legal or ceremonial *Atonement* was to be performed, for which purpoſe God did except, and reſerve the blood of thoſe Sacrifical Creatures from being eaten by Men, which reaſon is declared by God himſelf evidently (as to me ſeemeth) in theſe words, *I will ſet my face againſt that Soul that eateth Blood, and will cut him off from among his People, for the life of the fleſh is the Blood, and I have given it to you upon the Altar, to make an atonement for your Souls, for it is the Blood that maketh an Atonement for the Souls*, this was the law for the Blood of the Sacrifical Creatures. Lev. 17. 10, 11.

And as for the blood of other Creatures which were profane, and not to be uſed for Sacrifices, their blood was alſo *forbid-*

Lev. 17.13. Deut. 12.16. *den to be eaten by Men*, but by another Law was commanded to *be poured out upon the earth as water*, *and to be covered with dust*; this Law being but a ceremonial and Typical law must be confessed to become void and antiquated, when the Type was fulfilled by the blood-shedding and death of Christ, and that fully declared and published.

Quest. But then we are to enquire, what moved the *Apostolical Council* to revive that Antiquated law of abstaining from Blood, more than the other Ceremorials, of *Sacrifices*, *Circumcision*, *Paschal Lamb*, *Sabbatizings*, &c. And why they imposed this *Decree* or *Canon* upon the converted *Gentiles*?

Answ. 1. To this we answer. First, That the Apostles, directed by the Holy Ghost, did impose this Abstinence on the converted *Gentiles* in the Pedagogy of the Church, on purpose for compliance with the converted *Jews*, least they should be scandalized or offended with Christianity it self, when they should see Christians *eating Blood*, from which, themselves in the time of their *Judaism*, were by their law debarred, and could not suddenly be withdrawn from so old a Custom, untill they were more fully instructed in Christian Religion; for it might seem to them a disparagement, and

a contempt of *Moses* and his Laws: which reason is intimated by St. *James*, in that he said, *Moses is read in the Synagogues every Sabbath day*, which he spake in that very Council; so we our selves at our Tables, forbear the setting on of certain meats, which our selves like, because they would be offensive to some of our invited Guests, as Swines flesh, Cheese, and such like. Yet this Discipline of abstaining from Blood, was not intended to be a continual, and standing Law in Christianity, but only a temporary Ordinance, and to last no longer than there was danger apparent, of occasioning a Schism, or Division between the Converted *Jews*, and the Christian Gentiles. Acts 15. 21.

2. This Discipline did as well become the mildness of Christianity, as that old Law did the Religion of the *Jews*, whereby they were restrained from using such cruelties to Creatures, as possibly might be practised by Eating some parts of the bodies of Beasts, whilst other parts were preserved alive; which kind of cruelty was acted by the *Romans* upon the bodies of the captive *Jews*, at the last destruction of *Jerusalem*, when they were condemned to be devoured by Lions, or other Beasts, and were so cruelly used by the Beast-masters,

Jos. de Bello Ju. Lib. 7. that as *Josephus* reported, one half of their bodies were eaten, and the other half kept alive in warm blood, for a second meal for the Beasts.

3. This Discipline was needfull in Christianity, especially in those primitive times of Persecution, to confute those calumnies and false accusations, which the Heathens, and Persecutors raised against Christians of their *Thyestean Feasts*; as if in their Sacraments they had used to Eat the flesh and blood of Children, which they had for that use murthered, which thing the Christians abhorred, and to shew that they were far from any such bloody practices (by direction of that Apostolical Canon) they abstained even from the blood of Beasts, during the whole time of the Persecutions.

4. That Discipline which was intended to continue but for the aboveſaid time, is needfull, and of great concernment to be seriously considered and pondered in these times, as a clear evidence against the semi-universal deluge of *Transubstantiation*, whereby the Eating and Drinking of the living flesh and blood of Christ, is so fiercely and pertinaciously maintained, although the Apostles who forbad Blood, certainly in those very times did often communicate in the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ;

There-

Therefore they did not think that Sacrament to be turned into blood, nor did they in the least believe that Doctrine thereof, which is now taught; they did really and orally drink *the blood of the grape*, but in no wise orally *the Blood of Christ*. *Porpherie* sometime a *Christian*, but afterwards an *Apostate Idolater*, as *Socrates* reporteth, said *Sanguis est esca Demonum*, that Blood is the food of his Idol-Devils, in his Book *de Sacrificiis*. *Soc. l. 3. C. 19.* *Porphyr. 13.*

We should in the next place enquire, what Christ meant by those words of *drinking his Blood* which he spake, both before the Eucharistical Sacrament was set up, and also at the Institution thereof, which we must respit for a little time, untill we have cleared some Questions concerning the Apostolical Decree against Blood, which I have said was but a *Temporary Canon*, at least in part.

In that Council, and in their Rescript to the *Gentiles* of *Antioch*, three things are forbidden. 1. *Idol-meats.* 2. *Blood.* 3. *Fornication*, in these words, *That ye abstain from meats offered to Idols, and from Blood, and from Fornication* (for those other words, *things Strangled*, are implied in the word Blood.) *Acts 15. 29.*

The first of these three we are well assured,

was

was but *Temporary*, because S. *Paul* did soon after permit the eating of Meats brought from the *Shambles*, although they had been offered to Idols, as the common custom of the Gentile-Idolaters was in those times; and also, although the Christians did know, that those meats had been offered to Idols; only in case any Christian Brother should take offence thereat, then he adviseth to abstain, saying, *whatsoever is sold in the Shambles eat, asking no question for conscience sake*; and though they are *bid to a feast by an Unbeliever*, yet *eat*; *But if any man shall say unto you, this is offered unto Idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it.*

1 Cor. 10. 25. 27. 28.

The second concerning *Blood*, was also Temporary, for the reasons above-mentioned.

The third concerning *Fornication* was not Temporary, for it was forbidden by the *7th.* Precept of the *Moral Law*, and by the *Levitical* Law, *Lev.* 19. 29. *Deut.* 23. 17. and by the Gospel often. *Neither Fornicators nor Adulterers*, &c. *shall inherit the Kingdom of God*; and, *Whoremongers and Adulterers God will judge*, by which laws, both *Jews* and Christians were restrained, and also the very *Heathens* by the *Law moral*, although they took no notice thereof; therefore this law against Forni-

1 Cor. 6. 9, 18. Heb. 13. 4 Eph. 5. 3.

cation was in force before that Council sate, and will so continue, as long as the World endures.

But then our Question must be, why it pleased that Council to impose that *Canon* or *Decree* upon the *Gentiles*, seeing they were restrained before? *Quest.*

1. Our Answer is, that it was so ordered to direct not only those *Gentiles* which were already converted, but all others which afterward should be converted. *Answ.*

2. Because those *Gentiles*, which then continued in their Heathenism, did not account *Fornication* to be a vice or sin, having no commerce with the *Mosaical*, or Moral, or Evangelical Laws, neither had they any Civil, or Municipal law in force against it, as may appear by the most civilized, and best governed Commonwealth of *Rome*, whilst it was Heathen. Even *Tully* himself in one of his Orations delivered in Open Court, said, *Si quis est qui meretriciis amoribus interdictum Juventuti putet, est ille quidem valde severus*—And, *Abhorret ab hujus seculi licentia, & à majorum consuetudine atque concessu*—And, *Quando hoc non factum est? quando reprehensum? quando non permissum? quando fuit, ut quod licet, non liceret? He that thinks Fornication interdicted to young Men is very severe, it* *Tull. pro Cælio n.* 31.

is

is contrary to the licentiousness of this Age, and the custom of our Ancestors, and their Concessions. When was it not done? when was it reprehended? when was it not permitted? when was it unlawfull to act that which was lawfull? thus he; And for former times, we find this licentiousness to have been proclaimed in their Theaters. *Plus est scortorum fere, quam mnscarum olim cùm caletur maxime*; and, *Publicâ vìâ nemo ire vetat*—and, *Mercatus meretricium apud ædem Veneris*; *That there were more Harlots than flies, that Fornication was a common high-way, wherein no man was forbidden to walk*, that the *Temple of Venus was the market for Harlots*, thus *Plautus*: And a little after him *Terence* saith, *Non est flagitium in Adolescente scorteri*, &c.

Plaut. in Prol. Curcul. Pœn. a. 37,62,74

Ter. Adelph.

The Christian Writers also took notice of this piece of Heathenism, as St. *Austin* testifieth, *De verbis Apostoli, Ser. 4. Fornicari, inebriari licitè committuntur, sed non Dei legibus, quis enim ad Judicem ductus est, quia meretricis lupanar intravit? si uxorem habens, vitiavit ancillam, quis crimen habet?* &c. After him *Salvianus* saith, *Fornicatio nondum prohibita per leges Romanas*, and *Lupanaria ædificant, timent ne Homines nimis casti essent*, he addeth, That *the* Roman *laws which forbad Adultery, for removing*

Aug. To. 10. a. 38.

Salv. de Gub. li 7.

ving that corruption from Matrons, yet permitted Fornication with the unmarried Women. This Heathen practice continueth even to this day in *Rome-Christian*, and so it did here in *England*, for by *K. Hen.* 2. *and his Parliament*, the *Stews or Bordello* was permitted, and continued all the time that *England* held Correspondence with *Rome*, untill it was put down by *K. Hen.* 8. they had certain Signs painted on the walls of those Houses to be known by, whereof one was a *Cardinals Hat*, as *J. Stow* reports. Now let us return to the signification of Blood. *Stow's Survay.*

CHAP. XVI.

IT will not (I suppose) be denied, that the Apostolical Council did forbid the Eating of Blood, so as is said; And that the Apostles, and the Converted *Jews*, and the Christian *Gentiles*, did abstain from blood by vertue of this Decree; Add yet (notwithstanding that Apostolical Constitution) the Apostles themselves, and other Christians did drink the Blood of Christ, in that sense which Himself meant before the Sacrament, *John* 6. And also in the Sacrament

crament, of which he ſaid, *This is my Blood*, and, *Drink ye all of this*.

All this being true and confeſſed, we are next to enquire diligently, what our Redeemer meant by this word *Blood*, which certainly did not ſignifie his own very natural Blood, literally and grammatically taken; but ſome other thing, which for ſome weighty reaſon he was pleaſed to call *Blood*.

That other thing which he meant by Blood, we confidently affirm to be *his Soul*, his Human or reaſonable Soul, and this we doubt not to make clear and apparent (with Gods Aſſiſtance) by the Holy Scripture, becauſe we find by many overtures and plain expreſſions, that the *Life or Soul* in Holy Writ, by the Mouth of God is called *Blood*.

At the Creation of Man, God appointed to *Adam*, and ſo to the Ante-diluvian Patriarks for their food, only the *herbs bearing ſeed, and every tree, in which is the* Gen. 1.29. *fruit of a tree yielding ſeed*. But after the Flood, he gave to the *Patriark Noah, and his* Gen. 9.3. *Sons, every Moving thing that liveth, to be meat for them*; and although he gave them the fleſh of his Creatures, yet ſo early he forbad the Eating of the blood with the fleſh, giving this reaſon; *Fleſh with the life thereof*

thereof, which is the Blood thereof ſhall you not eat. V. 4.

The Blood (we ſee) is there called *Life*, although we know that *Blood* in propriety of ſpeech, is not the *Life or Soul* of Man or Beaſt, but only ſignifieth the *Life or Soul*; for one may looſe ſome Blood by a wound, or otherwiſe, yet the life may continue, and becauſe the Soul it ſelf is inviſible, therefore that which is viſible is named for the Soul; and becauſe the blood is the companion, and alſo the chariot of the Soul, and becauſe the letting out, or ſpilling the Vital blood, carrieth out with it the life and Soul, therefore God preſently after called Mans Blood, *the Blood of our lives, which* V. 5. *he will require at the hand of every Beaſt, and at the hand of every Man* (who ſhall commit homicide) *at the hand of every mans Brother, will he require the life of Man*, by which words it appeareth, that Blood and Life here ſignifie only the Soul.

In another place, where Blood is forbidden, it is ſaid, *The life of the fleſh is in the Blood*, and, *The life of all fleſh is the Blood* Lev. 17. 11, 14. *thereof*, and more plainly God ſaith, *The blood is for the life thereof*; whereby it may appear, that Blood was not eſteemed to be really the life or Soul, but only to repreſent, or ſignifie, or to ſtand for *the life or Soul.*

St. *Auſtin*

Deut. 12. 23. St. *Austin* considering that place in *Deut.* where it is said, *Be sure thou eat not the blood, for the Blood is the life*; saith, *Sanguis pecoris ejus anima, &c. in signo, The blood of the creature is the Soul, but only in sign*, he addeth, *Our Lord doubted not to say, this is my body, when he gave the sign of his Body.* The same *Father* on the like words

Cont. Adimant. C. 12. T. 6.

Aug. con. Adv. legis L. 2. c. 6. *Lev.* 17. 14. saith, *Anima est sanguis, non quia hoc erat, sed quia significabat, sicut dicitur Petra est Christus, Blood is the Soul*, not that blood is really the Soul, but because blood signifieth the Soul, even as St. *Paul* speaketh, *the Rock was Christ*; and it is usual in Heathen Writers, to put blood for the Soul, and the Soul for blood, as in *Virgil.*

1 Cor. 10. 4.

Virg. Æn. 9. *Purpuream vomit ille animam* —— And, *Sanguine, quærendi reditus, Animâq; litandum,*

Grot. de Satisf. n. 10. 14. As *Hugo Grotius* hath observed to be frequent, that because that Blood is instead, or place of the Soul often put, therefore it is called the Soul; so that by offering the blood of Beasts, they meant the life, or *Vital blood* of those Creatures killed and sacrificed.

When the Scripture saith, *Whoso sheddeth*

Gen. 9. 6. *Mans blood, by Man shall his blood be shed*; every

every one knows, that by ſhedding of Blood in that place, is meant the taking away a Mans life; *Eſt animæ non parcere*, ſaith *Iſychius* upon theſe words. *Judas* ſaid, *I have ſinned in betraying Innocent Blood*, he meant his betraying his Maſters life to death. The *Jews* ſaid, *His Blood be upon us, and our children*, that is, let his death or murther be laid to our charge. The *Apoſtle* ſaith to his *Hebrews*, *Ye have not yet reſiſted unto Blood*, that is to Martyrdom, or loſs of your lives. So when Chriſt ſpake of drinking his Blood, he ſpake of his Soul, for ſo his Blood ſignified, and muſt neceſſarily be ſo underſtood.

Iſych. in Lev. Mat. 27. 4 25. Hebr. 12. 4

But how we can be truly ſaid to drink a Soul, ſeeing the ſoul of Man is a meer *Spirit*, and incorporeal, and therefore not literally drinkable; and yet that theſe words of Chriſt muſt really be performed: How both theſe can ſtand together, is next to be enquired.

CHAP. XVII.

THat the Blood of Chriſt (in theſe words) ſignifieth the human Soul of Chriſt, I nothing doubt, and to drink his

Soul orally, is as impossible as it is for us to drink his Blood literally taken, which is now in Heaven; therefore (as I have shewed before) that the Eating of his Flesh signifieth only the Union of his Flesh with our flesh; so the Drinking of his Blood or Soul signifieth, only the union of his Soul with our Souls, which two Unions, *viz.* of our flesh and souls with his Flesh and Soul, are so necessary, in order to the redemption of our bodies by his Body, and of our souls by his Soul, that otherwise we could not with Justice be redeemed by him.

This Union which seemeth so secret and mysterious, is declared to us by Christ in this Figurative or Metaphorical speech of *Drinking his Blood*, which is all one, as if he had said, except my Soul be united with your Souls; so as that wine which you drink for your food and nourishment, is turned into your Blood, and then is joyned and united with your Persons, and becomes One with you, otherwise your Souls cannot be redeemed by me; for the word *Blood* signifies the *Soul* of Christ, and drinking his Blood certainly signifies the conjunction, or union of his Soul with our Souls, in order as a necessary way or method, to put us into a capacity of redemption of our souls by his Soul. For we

cannot

cannot be capable of the benefits of the Passions, death, and Obedience of Christ, except we be One with him, both by the union of our flesh with his Flesh, and of our souls with his Soul; because God doth neither punish, nor reward one for another, as is at large shewed before. Chap. 4.

Therefore, that the Son of God might be every way fitly qualified to be a Redeemer of Mankind, he assumed human Flesh from the same Original that we had our flesh, that thereby he might be a Redeemer of our flesh or bodies; and he assumed an human Soul from the same Fountain, from which all our Souls sprang, that thereby he might be a Redeemer of our souls, as *Athanasius* hath observed in his Book of the Incarnation, *In Redemptione corpus pro corpore, & anima pro anima reddenda fuit, & integrum aliquid pro integro homine; He was to give his Body for the redemption of our bodies, and to yield up his Soul for our Souls, and his whole Man for our whole Man.* *Athan. T. 3. n. 3.*

There are three Ingredients to be considered in the Redeemer. 1. His Divinity or Godhead (for he was and is God, the most High, and the only God.) 2. His human Flesh or Body. 3. His human Soul. By the two latter by him so assumed, as is

said, he became *Perfect Man*; as by the former he was, and is *Perfect God*.

His pure Godhead alone, and considered without his Human nature assumed, could not be a Redeemer, because the law was not imposed upon God, or the Son of God, as only so, but upon Mankind or Sons of Men: Nor could the pure Godhead suffer death, which was to be suffered by the Redeemer.

Or if the Godhead had assumed only an human Body or Flesh, without an human Soul; this could have been but a Redeemer of the Body, at most (if that) but not of the Soul.

Or if the Godhead had assumed only an human Soul without a Body, it could not have redeemed our bodies, nor our whole Man, as the Axiome of Divines teacheth us. *Divisus Christus non est Salvator*, viz. If Christ had not united all these Ingredients in his one Person, his Godhead, his Flesh and his Soul, we could not have him for our Saviour.

Beza Cat. Part. 2. p. 18.

Or if Christ had been only a meer Man, consisting of Soul and Body, as we all do, and had not been God, he could not have been our Redeemer; because it was only his Divinity, joyned with, and united personally with his Flesh and Soul, that gave lustre,

luſtre, worth, and infinite value to his humane Nature, ſo that (for the great work of mans Redemption) it was neceſſary that the Redeemer ſhould be, not only *Perfect Man of a reaſonable Soul, and Humane fleſh ſubſiſting*, but alſo with them *Perfect God*.

Or if Chriſt, being very God, had really aſſumed a Body, and alſo a Soul otherwiſe, and not from his Virgin Mother; but had made a Body, and alſo created a Soul for himſelf, which had not been derived from Mankind, and ſo not united with our bodies and ſouls; or if his Body or Soul had come down from Heaven (as ſome Hereticks ſaid) and paſſed through the Virgins Womb only, as water doth through a pipe, and had been only for a time an Inhabitant, or Inmate of the Womb, and had not been really the *Seed of the Woman*, and *the Son of the Virgin*, and the very *Fruit of the Womb* both in Soul and in Body, and derived from the firſt Man, and the firſt Woman, as we all are; he could not have been our Redeemer, becauſe he could not be united otherwiſe with all Mankind in fleſh and ſoul, nor we with him.

For as our Union with his Fleſh (which is called the Eating of his fleſh) muſt needs be with it, as it is the fleſh of the Son of Man, which ſignifieth, that it muſt be with

that Flesh or Body of his, which he assumed and derived from Mankind, by being conceived in the Womb, and not from any other flesh or body, which the Son of God had sometime taken on him, otherwise than by Conception and Birth, (as is before observed in his Apparition, and converse with the Patriark *Abraham*) so likewise the union of our Souls with his Soul (which is called the *Drinking of his Blood*) must be with that Soul of his, which was so derived from the first Man, and the first Woman by Propagation, as all our Souls are, otherwise we cannot be united in our Souls with his Soul, neither could he be a Redeemer of our Souls.

Gen. 18.
Supra 6. 6, 7.

This Doctrine of our Union with Christ, both in our Bodies, and also in our Souls was intimated, though something darkly (as to me seemeth) at the Institution of his holy Eucharistical Supper, which is next to be very briefly touched.

CHAP. XVIII.

WHen our Saviour had a long time concealed the Mysterious way, or manner how our Redemption was to be effected

effected by him; and how his own proper and personal Death, might be satisfactory to Divine Justice, for, and instead of the deserved deaths of all Men: Yet (that he Might not leave his Disciples altogether ignorant in so weighty a Concernment) he was pleased a little before his death, in some measure to reveal that Secret to his Apostles, and by them to his succeeding Church, for which purpose only, he instituted his last *Holy Supper*, to be a visible Sign or Sacrament, and also a Memorial thereof in all Generations, untill his Coming again.

First therefore, *He took Bread*, and gave it to them, and said, *Take, Eat, This is my Body which is given for you*; as if he had said, my Body is already to you, such as this Bread will be to you; for by Eating and Digesting it, the Bread will be your nourishment, it will be joyned and united with your Bodies, and grow into one flesh with your flesh, and be one Body with you. Luke 22.19.

Christ calleth himself Bread, (*Ego sum Panis*) because, as bread being eaten and digested, becomes incorporate or incarnate with us; so is Christ Incarnate, or rather Concarnate with us. We receive our Flesh from our Mothers, the bread which the Mother eateth, is converted into milk, with which the Infant is nourished, and John 6.

thereby is fleshed and groweth; so that the Bread and the Child become united, and grow into one Body.

St. *Austin* saith concerning this very thing; *Quod manducat mater, hoc manducat Infans; sed quia minùs idoneus est Infans, qui pane vescatur, ipsum panem Mater incarnat, & per humilitatem mamillæ, & lactis fluxum, de ipso pane pascit Infantem.* That which nourisheth the Mother, the same nourisheth the Infant, but because the Infant is not able to eat bread, therefore the mother doth first digest, and so incarnate the bread, and uniteth it with her own body, and of it, by her mild and tender Breast she produceth milk, by which the Infant is mediatly so fed with the said bread.

Aug. Psa. 33. Ser. 1.

Such is the Union of the Flesh of Christ with our flesh, because both he, and we received our flesh from that one Original lump of the first Man, wherein both he and we were united, and thereby he and we became one Body, just as our food becomes one flesh and one body with that Body of ours, which we had, before any new Addition was made to it by any new food, which is the reason why the Scripture accounteth Christ and his Members to be but one Body, as the Apostle saith; *We being many, are one Body in Christ*; and, *We are the Body of Christ*,

Ro. 12, 5. 1 Cor.

Christ and Members in particular, and, *Ye are all one in Christ Jesus*; and, *We are Members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.* 1 Cor. 12. 27. Gal. 3. 28 Eph. 5. 30

By vertue of this Union, the obedience of Christ, both *Active and Passive*, is, and justly may be accounted ours, because Christ and his Members are One. And for this consideration only, and for this reason only, Christ said of the Sacramental Bread, *This is my Body which is given for you.*

Likewise of the *Wine* Christ said, *This is my Blood*, ... *Drink ye all of this.* We know that by *Blood*, the life or soul is signified (as is before proved) therefore the Sacramental Wine represented his Soul; the Wine which we drink (as well as the Bread which we eat) becomes our nourishment, and so unites it self with our Persons, and grows into one bulk with us, and is really one with us, and thereby it becomes to us such as the Soul of Christ is already to us; for our souls and the Soul of Christ are really united, because his Soul, and our souls, and the souls of all our Ancestors and Posterities ever were, and still will be derived, and propagated from that one Original Soul of the first Man, in whose Soul at its very Creation and Insufflation, the Soul of Christ, and all our Souls are virtually inclu-

included and united: Therefore surely, the meaning of those words of Christ must be this, that his Soul and our Souls must have been so united, as well as his Flesh and our flesh, that so he may be fitly the Redeemer both of our Bodies and of our Souls; for certainly, no man can have Redemption by him, except (as a necessary Preparative thereunto) he be really united with him, both in Flesh and in Soul, which is that very thing which Christ called *the Eating of his Flesh, and Drinking his Blood.*

This Doctrine is not new, but hath been long ago taught by the School, in those times when Truth might be declared without danger of the Fagot: For *Pet. Lombard*, about the year of Christ 1150. (which was before *Transubstantiation* was established in the Church of *Rome*) thus writeth: *Christ* (saith he) *took on himself the whole Nature of Man, that he might redeem the whole Man, therefore his Assumption is celebrated in the Holy Supper, by the two Elements of Bread and Wine. Panis ad carnem refertur; Vinum ad Animam, ut animæ & carnis susceptio in Christo, & utriusque liberatio in nobis significetur;* The Bread representeth the Flesh, and the Wine the Soul; that thereby the Assuming of a Body and a Soul by Christ, and the Deliverance or Redemption

Sent. 4. Dist. 11.

demption of our Bodies and Souls by him, may be signified. So *Clemens Romanus* long before, *Christus dedit carnem suam pro carne nostra, & animam suam pro anima nostra, vid. f. n. 3. in* Clem. Rom.

Those that imagin that the *Sacramental Chalice*, represenith only the Blood of Christ, and that those words of Christ, *This is my Blood* signified only the meer natural Blood of Christ, Grammatically, properly, and literally taken; such do greatly err, and mistake the Mystery, for this cannot possibly be the meaning thereof, because (as is before said) his meer Blood was not Redemptive; for the Act of Redemption, consisted only in the powring out his precious Life and Soul for us; so that by the Blood, the Soul must needs be meant, and the Sacramental Wine, must needs relate to the Life or Soul of Christ. *Sup. cap.* 14.

Those likewise that teach the withholding of the Sacramental Chalice from the People, or Lay-Communicants, do misunderstand the meaning thereof; they pretend, that after the pronouncing of the words of *their Consecration*, the Wine is not Wine, for that the substance of Wine is quite gone and annihilated, leaving nothing behind but only the meer Accidents, *viz.* the colour, taste, and quantity of the Wine, but not the

the Wine it self, and that the Chalice doth contain only the Blood of Christ instead of the Wine; and because they make the People believe, that in their little *Wafer-Host*, the whole Christ is contained, *viz.* his Body and Blood, therefore in Receiving the Host, they receive both the Flesh, and the Blood by *Concomitancy*. But herein they err, in that they think that by the word *Blood*, only meer blood is meant, which indeed doth signifie not literally Blood, but the Soul of Christ, in which Soul if the People do not really Communicate, that is, if their Souls be not really united with the Soul of Christ, they cannot be in a full capacity of the Redemption of their souls by his Soul. Besides, what need was there, that Christ should require with the Eating of his flesh particularly, as another thing, the Drinking of his Blood; if by Blood he had meant only *meer Blood*, seeing that the living Flesh of Christ must needs include his Blood, as themselves acknowledge.

The laborious and tedious Disputes of Divines, of contrary Persuations in Religion concerning the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, whether it be a *carnal and corporal* Presence, or only a *Spiritual Presence*, I conceive (with submission to Superiors) to have been as needless, as we have found them

them to be fruitleſs and endleſs; their various gloſſes upon the Scriptural words in that buſineſs, have more obſcured the queſtion, as *Origen* ſaid of the Expoſition of a paſſage of St. *Paul. Hic ſermo non ſui natura, ſed interpretatione obſcurior factus eſt.* And *Maldonate*, a learned *Jeſuit* of late obſerved concerning a place in St. *Luke*, *Neſcio an facilior hic locus fuiſſet, ſi nemo eum expoſuiſſet.* They both conclude, that ſome Scriptures would be more eaſily underſtood, if Expoſitors had not too much tampered with them, and ſo verily I think of thoſe words, which mention the Eating and Drinking the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt.

Orig. in Ro. 12. 16.

Mald. in Lu. 2. 34.

The real and true Preſence of the Fleſh, and Blood, or Soul of Chriſt, is not to be thought to be in the Elements, or Sacramental ſigns of Bread and Wine, neither is there any need of, or benefit by ſuch a Preſence; but the true, and concerning, and beneficial Preſence of Chriſt is in, and with the Communicants, which Preſence is effected by the Union of his Fleſh and Soul with our fleſh and ſoul, ſo as hath been before ſhewed.

Wherefore, if we will be content, and reſt ſatisfied with this plain, and eaſie Expoſition of thoſe words of Chriſt (which I firmly

firmly believe to be true,) *viz.* that the *Eating and Drinking of His flesh and blood,* signifieth only *the union or conjunction of his Flesh and Soul with our flesh and soul*; all difficulties and obscurities will be cleared without any violence to those words of Christ. And the order and method, in which the just and mercifull Godhead proceeded in preparing, and in making a way to the Redemption of our lapsed Nature, will be (to our great Consolation) made manifest to us.

We have seen before, how our flesh, and the Flesh of Christ have been united; in the next place, we are now to show, how the Union of our souls with his Soul hath been wrought, and really performed.

CHAP. XIX.

IN order to the understanding of the Union of our Souls with the Soul of Christ (which is mysteriously vailed, by an obscure description under a Figurative Speech of *Drinking his Blood,*) we are first to enquire of, and to find out the *Original* or *Spring,* whence both Christ, and we have derived and received our Souls; For if it may

may appear, that the human Soul of Christ did proceed from the very same Fountain, from which all Men in the world have received their Souls; then it cannot be denied, that his Soul and our souls, were joyned and united in that one Original Fountain, which is *the Soul of the first Man.*

For, why should it seem less credible or harder to conceive, that all Human Souls are derived, and have proceeded from that one Soul of the first Man, than to believe and acknowledge, that all Human Bodies, Christs and all, are derived and propagated from the body or lump of the said first Man? Surely no Learned, or but Intelligent Christian will deny, that Christ, and all Men were united in the *Loins of Adam.*

Now if it be enquired whence, or from whom Christ immediately received his Soul? We answer, that he received it from his Blessed *Virgin Mother*, and in her Womb, and that it was derived and propagated from her Virgin Soul, for he had no Earthly Father, from whose Thigh his Soul could be propagated.

If it be again enquired, whence the blessed *Virgin* received her Soul? We answer, that she also received it from her Mothers Soul, and in the Womb, and so we affirm

of

of all the souls of Men and Women, that they are propagated from the souls of their Mothers, and that this Propagation ascendeth ultimately unto *Eve* the first Woman, from whose Soul the Soul of Christ, and the Souls of all her Posterity are descended.

If it be farther enquired, when *Eve* had, and received her Soul? We answer, that she received her Soul with her Body also from the first Man, her Body from his Body, and her Soul from his Soul; and whence *Adam* received his Soul, the Scripture evidently declareth, that his Soul was immediately Created and Inspired by God, in those words, *God breathed into his nostrils the breath of Life, and Man became a living Soul.* Gen. 2. 7.

We farther affirm, that the Soul of *Adam* was the only Soul that was created by God; and also, that from that one Soul, all human Souls from that time till now, and also until the end of the World are, and will be derived and propagated. We read not of any other particular Soul in the Holy Scriptures, that was immediately created by God, because, indeed all Human Souls were Originally couched, and virtually included in that one *Prime Soul* of the first Man, Inspired by God.

Good

Good Reader, obſerve with me (that which hath been formerly obſerved by other Writers) that thoſe words, which our *Engliſh* Tranſlation renders *the breath of Life*, *Gen.* 2. 7. might, and ſhould more fitly and truly have been rendred *the breath of Lives*, *Spiraculum Vitarum*: Becauſe in the *Original*, the word which is tranſlated *Life*, is a word Plural, and ſignifieth *Lives*, it may therefore reaſonably be conceived, that the moſt wiſe Spirit of God, intended to ſignifie by that *Plural word*, that the whole multitude of human Lives and Souls, were *potentially and virtually* reſiding in that one created Soul of *Adam*, and were to be derived and propagated from thence to all Mankind, Chriſt and all; as being the Spring and Fountain of all future Souls; for of him only, and of none other it is ſaid, that *God breathed into him the Breath of life or lives.*

Bucan. p. 86. 88. Woolnor. p. 77.

Gen. 2. 7. Chaim. of Lives.

We know that the firſt Woman had a Soul proper to her ſelf, but we find not that God did newly Create, or Breath into her a new and ſeveral Soul, becauſe ſhe did receive her ſoul from the Man, and ſo it muſt have been produced for weighty Reaſons, and not any other way; her ſoul was derived from his ſoul; the Godhead did not create two Originals, or Fountains

of ſouls, nor of bodies, for both the fleſh and the ſoul of *Eve*, and of all Men with Chriſt alſo, were neceſſarily to be derived from the fleſh and ſoul of *Adam*, for otherwiſe, although the firſt Man, and the firſt Woman were united in fleſh, yet they had not been united in Soul, except *Eve's* ſoul had been derived from the ſoul of *Adam*, nor could the ſoul of Chriſt by any other way have come from *Adams* ſoul, and conſequently he could not have been the Redeemer of the ſouls of *Adams* Poſterity. Certainly all Men in the World are *Adamites*, both in reſpect of their bodies, and alſo of their ſouls, ſo is Chriſt himſelf *Ben-Adam*, therefore the Apoſtle calls him *the Laſt Adam*, becauſe he was the Son of *Adam*, therefore he is called by his Fathers name.

1 Cor. 15.45.

By reaſon of the Union of our bodies with Chriſts Body in the loyns of *Adam*, the Apoſtle ſaith we are *members of his Fleſh*, and by reaſon of the Union of all Mens ſouls in that one Original Soul of *Adam*, the ſame Apoſtle ſaid to the *Athenian Philoſophers*, that *God hath made of one Blood all Nations of Men.* Blood in Scripture ſignifieth the ſoul, as hath been proved before, and ſo I believe it doth in that place, and ſo the meaning muſt be, that God hath

Acts 17.26.

hath made of one Soul all the ſouls of all nations of Men, which ſurely is true.

For if their was a neceſſity, in order to the Redemption of our Bodies, that the *Redeemer* muſt have received his fleſh by Propagation from the firſt Man; the like neceſſity muſt needs be for the Redemption of our Souls, that the Redeemer muſt have received his Soul by *Traduction* from the Soul of the ſame firſt Man, in whom the Redeemer and the Redeemed, were neceſſarily to have been united in ſoul, as well as in body, otherwiſe he could be but an Half-Redeemer, and we but *Semiredempti*, i. e. redeemed but in one part, or *half-redeemed*, for it would prove but a Redemption of our Bodies only, and not of our Souls.

Gregory Nazianzen in an Epiſtle to *Cledonius* a Prieſt, which goes under the title of the 51 Oration, thus writeth; *The Son of God took upon him the Nature of Man, and all that of Man, which needed help and recovery; therefore he muſt needs have taken the Soul, as well as the fleſh from Man, for otherwiſe, he would be like to a Man, who having a ſore eye, and a ſore foot, and ſhould apply a Medicine to the foot only, and quite neglect the eye.* Thus he, ſo that although our bodies were well provided for by having a *Naz. Oration. 51.*

Redeemer, yet the ſouls would want a Redemption for themſelves, and ſo the ſentence of God would be executed on them, *The Soul that ſinneth, it ſhall die.*

Ezc. 18. 4

But the Mercifull Godhead took care, both of our bodies, and of our Souls, and therefore ſent God the Son (as the *Apoſtle* ſaith) *in the likeneſs of ſinfull Fleſh, and for ſin condemned ſin in the fleſh.* So likewiſe did he ſend the ſame Son of God in the likeneſs of a *ſinfull ſoul*, thereby to condemn ſin in the Soul; the Lord Jeſus is a Saviour, not only of bodies, but of ſouls alſo, and is therefore called by the *Apoſtle*, *the Sheepherd and Biſhop of Souls*, as *Moſes and Aaron* had formerly ſtiled him, *The God of the Spirits* (or Souls) *of all Fleſh.* The Son of God was the Creator, not only of bodies, but alſo of ſouls, and the Son of Man was, and is the Redeemer of both.

Rom. 8. 3.

1 Pet. 2. 25.

Num. 16. 22.

For this gracious purpoſe only, God did unite himſelf with Mankind, not only in Fleſh, but in Soul alſo, and thereby he became a Compleat *Emanuel*: And this union or conjunction of God with Man, was effected by the *Propagation*, or *Tradution* of the Fleſh and Soul of Chriſt, from the fleſh and ſoul of the firſt Man, as all our Bodies and Souls have been, and now are, and will

will be to the end of the World. Of the Traduction of our bodies no Man doubteth, but of the Original and Traduction of Souls great disputes have been, and yet are, of which we are next in order to consider.

CHAP. XX.

THE Doctrine of the Original of the Soul of Christ, and of all human Souls, and consequently the Doctrine of the Redemption of our souls by the Soul of Christ, hath been much obscured by the vain, and trifling Arguments of some natural *Philosophers*; and as much by the frivolous Queries of some late *Theologues*, whereas some learned *Physicians* (to whom Truth is more beholding in this point) have with great judgment, and by their Experiences shewed and proved, that our Souls are derived by *Traduction*, from the Souls of our Mothers in the Womb, (as the Soul of Christ certainly was) and as one of them saith, *Instar surculi ex trunco*, as a young grift sucketh life from the stock. And the Souls of all Mothers (as is beforesaid) are derived from the Soul of the first

Jacobus Horstius. Geor. Horstius: Animas propagari ab animabus parentum putat Keckerman *Phys.* p. 630.

Man; unto which Doctrine all men, who do rightly apprehend and understand the order and method of Redemption, to consist in the *Union* of Christ with Mankind, will be driven at last to consent.

Those Men that oppose the *Traduction of Souls* from the Soul of *Adam*, demand how it is possible, that such an innumerable company of Souls can be derived from one single Soul, seeing the Soul is a Spirit, and indivisible, and therefore not to be parted by Decisions, and mincings into such several parcels; for so in time it would have nothing left to it self, but would be utterly annihilated.

But these Men may as reasonably doubt, how so many thousands of Bodies could proceed from that one single Body of the first Man, during the 930 years of his life, without any diminution of the quantity or dimensions of his Body, seeing they were all Originally in his Loyns. Or how the Sun communicates his light to every star in Heaven, without any diminution or lessening his Light; nothing is more like the Soul than light. The Philosophers called the Soul of Man φῶτ, *propter cognationem cum lumine*, as *Plutarch* saith, because it is so like to light, and Christ is said *to Enlighten every Man*, because he hath given a reason-

Plut. con. Colot.

John 1. 9.

reasonable Soul to all Men, as Expositors agree. St. *Austin* resembles the traduction of the Soul to the Light of a lamp. *Ignis lucernæ integer manet, licet altera de illa accendatur*; Millions of Tapers may receive light from one single Taper, without diminishing the light of that one Taper; and so our Souls are propagated from that one Original Soul, without any division or diminution thereof. *Aug. cont. Pelag. T. 7. n. 63*

Let it be considered, that the Soul of the first Man was created immediately by God, of which it is said, *God breathed into his nostrils the breath of Life*, or of *Lives*; this Breath of God, was *Spiraculum Omnipotens*, of which the Psalmist saith, *By the Breath of the Lord the Heavens were made, and all the Host of them by the Breath of his mouth.* The human Soul hath a prerogative of its Original, above other inferiour *Animals*, of whom it is never said, that *God breathed into them the Breath of life.* That first Soul of Man especially, was like unto *Fire*, as one saith of all Human souls, *Igneus est Ollis vigor*— It surely had the vigour of fire, and did extend it self into the grand Corporation of all Mankind; as one spark of fire may enflame a whole City. Gen. 2. 7. *Bucan. p. 86. 88.* Psal. 33. 6 *Virg. Æn. 6.*

The brute Creatures, ever since their first Creation, did propagate their Souls to

their kind; and to this day those Creatures do receive their souls by Traduction from their Dams. The greatest Scioliſts in Natural Philoſophy, cannot reaſonably prove any other Original of thoſe brute Souls, but only by propagation, which yet they deny to human Souls.

It muſt be confeſſed (by Chriſtians) that the ſouls of brute Creatures were at the beginning created by God, as the reaſonable Soul of *Adam* was; yet the ſouls of Brute Creatures are mortal, but the reaſonable Souls of Men are immortal; the reaſon is, becauſe the Divine Nature did perſonally unite it ſelf with our whole human Nature, which is the only reaſon why human Souls do not die, and that human Bodies after death, ſhall riſe again to Life, at the general Reſurrection. But the Divine Nature, did not ſo unite it ſelf with the nature of thoſe other inferiour Creatures, which are therefore left to periſh utterly: Of which ſomething hath been ſaid before, and more will be ſaid in its due place.

Cap. 11.

The prime cauſe of the propagation of Human ſouls, , is the gift of God by his Benediction, recorded in theſe words, *God bleſſed them, and ſaid unto them, be fruitfull, and multiply, and repleniſh the Earth.* Can

Gen. 1. 28.

we

we imagin that this Benediction of fruitfulneſs and multiplying, ſhould extend to fleſh, or bodies only, and not to Souls? Whereas the like bleſſing of fiſhes and fowls, enabled them to produce and propagate not only bodies, but the whole Creatures, *viz.* both the bodies, and the ſouls of their Kinds, of which Benediction we thus read, *God created Whales, and every living creature which moveth, and every winged fowl;* Gen. 1. 21, *and God bleſſed them, and ſaid, be fruitfull,* 22. *and multiply,* &c. By vertue of this *Benediction,* thoſe Creature are enabled unto this day, to produce their kinds, both in bodies and in ſouls. This gift and bleſſing of fruitfulneſs both of fowl, and of cattle, is alſo again renewed after the Flood, and repeated, *Gen.* 8. 17. and alſo of Mankind, *Gen.* 9. 1. *God bleſſed Noah and his Sons, and ſaid unto them, be fruitfull, and multiply, and repleniſh the Earth.* Gen. 8. 17, 9. 1,

It may ſeem ſtrange that thoſe Divines, who confeſs the *Traduction* of our bodies with the Body of Chriſt, from the loyns of the firſt Man, as being neceſſary for Redemption of our bodies; yet that they ſhould deny the Traduction of our Souls, with the Soul of Chriſt from the firſt Man, which is altogether as needfull for the Redemption of our Soul,

In

In the Holy Scripture, care is taken to declare the derivation of our ſouls from our Parents, rather than of our Bodies, becauſe that of Souls is more ſecret than the other of Bodies. *Gen.* 46. 26. it is ſaid; *All the ſouls which came with* Jacob *into* Egypt, *which came out of his loyns, (or thigh) all the Souls were ſixty and ſix.*

Gen. 46.26.

How Souls can be truly ſaid to come from the loyns, or thigh of the Man (without a Figure or Metonymy) is hard to be underſtood, except we will thus apprehend it, *viz.* that although the Souls of Mankind, being in the Womb, are immediately, and truly derived from the ſouls of the Mothers; yet they are here ſaid to come from the loyns of the Man, becauſe the ſeed of Conception, which came from the Man, hath it it ſelf *Potentiam receptivam*, a power or capacity of receiving the ſoul or life, (though it hath not *Potentiam productivam*, any power of it ſelf to produce, or introduce the Soul:) And becauſe the Womb alone, without that ſeminal conception from the Man, cannot produce a ſoul or life, therefore are the Souls ſaid to come from the loyns of the Man; for there never was, nor ever will be a Child-bearing Woman, without the Cooperation of Man or Malekind, except only that miraculous Child-

Childbirth of Christ by his *blessed Virgin-Mother*, which was wrought by the *Holy Ghost*. Nor was there ever any Soul derived immediately from Man, but only the soul of *Eve*, which accompanied her flesh at her Production out of the side of the Man. But ever since *Eve*, all her Posterity have received their lives or souls in the Womb, from the lives or souls of their Mothers, as may appear probably by the time, when the Conception is first *animated* in the Womb, which is next to be considered.

The reports of Buddas & Plato are Fables, Hier. 2. 14.

CHAP. XXI.

CConcerning the *time* when the said Conception in the Womb, is first *animated*, or enlivened with a Soul, which is called *Quickning*; both Philosophers and learned Physicians, and also our experienced Matrons, who have born, and brought forth many children, have informed us; That some Conceptions are not quickned, but about the end of 20 Weeks, others at 15 Weeks, and some at 10 Weeks, and surely at the first instant, or beginning of the Conception, the Soul is not presently Infused: So

Aristotle

Arist. de Gen. Ani. l. 2. c. 3. *Aristotle* acknowledgeth, that the soul is not then *Actually* in the conceived Seed, but only *Potentially*, so as is before said. Now if it be granted, that our souls come from the Souls of our Parents, and also, that they are not transmitted with the Seed from the Father; it will follow, that they cannot in reason be thought to be propagated from the Father; because no Man will believe, that after so long a time, whilst the Conception remains in the womb without life or soul, and also the Man being absent, in a far remote distance of place from the Woman (as it may, and doth many times happen) I say it cannot be imagined, that at the instant of Quickning, the Soul or Life should wander from the Father, by a kind of *Metempsychosis*, or Transmigration, unto the mothers Womb. This being impossible, it must follow, that the Soul necessarily doth proceed, and is derived only, and immediately from the Soul of the mother, wherein, if she fail, by reason of some continued Indisposition of the Womb, she is called *Barren*, and because the Animation of the Conception is only from the Woman, therefore (because of her failing therein) *Barrenness* is imputed only to the Woman, and not at all to the Man, though Childless.

Jer. 22.30.

It

It is so with the Seed of Man, which is conceived in the Womb, as it is with meat received into the stomach, which hath no life in it self *Actually*, but it hath a power or capacity to receive life, which life it will afterwards *actually* receive, when it shall be really united with the former parts of the Body, for then the life and soul will enter into it, as they did before, into all the additional parts of our Bodies; for we see that our bodies have been augmented by our food, and have grown into so great a bulk, from our so small dimensions at our Birth.

This being evidently true, why should it seem less credible, that the Soul of the mother entreth into, and enliveneth her Conception in the womb; then it is to believe and acknowledge, that the Soul doth enter into and enliven the new acquired parts of our Bodies, which have been added by our food?

The time and manner of the Soul's entring into the Conception, is thus described by that learned Physician before mentioned; when (saith he) the parts of the *Embryon* are once shaped, formed, and perfected to that use in the womb, then doth the life or soul of the Mother, together with the Vital Spirit, proceed from her heart, *Fac. Horstius.*

heart, and enter into that fruit of her womb. This is the time when we receive our Souls, by traduction from the ſouls of our Mothers; and this is the time of the *Union* of our ſouls with the Soul of Chriſt, which Chriſt himſelf called *Drinking his Blood.*

That common ſaying concerning the Original of the Soul, *Creando infunditur, & infundendo creatur*; if it be meant of every particular human Soul, is very erroneous and untheological, and will appear anon to be Heretical; becauſe it is deſtructive of the Doctrine of Redemption, except we will confine it, and underſtand it to be ſpoken only of the Soul of *Adam*, which was the firſt, and the only human Soul, that ever could truly and properly be ſaid to be ſo created and infuſed.

Neither is the time of Drinking the Blood of Chriſt to be confined, or thought to be firſt performed, when we receive the Sacrament thereof, becauſe the Blood of Chriſt is not really in the Sacramental Chalice, neither is his Soul there, but his blood or Soul are in the Communicants, for this drinking of his Blood (which is really intended by thoſe words) muſt have been performed, although the Sacrament had never been ſet up; for we drink the Blood of Chriſt at our

our quickning in the Womb, becauſe then our blood or ſouls, are united with the Blood or Soul of Chriſt, when we are not in any capacity of Receiving the Sacrament thereof: Therefore all the *Latine Fathers*, and all *later Theological Writers*, although they are of ſeveral and oppoſite Perſuaſions in Religion, yet they generally Read thoſe words of Chriſt, *Niſi Biberitis*, which I conceive to ſignifie a *Tenſe* of the *time paſt*, *Except ye have drank*, as is obſerved before of the word *Eat*. The fleſh and blood of Chriſt is not now to be eaten and drank really, for that was actually performed before, even at our Union with his Fleſh and Soul, in our Mothers Wombs.

St. *Auſtin* upon thoſe words, *Pſal.* 22. 10. *Thou art my God from my Mothers belly*, obſerveth, that although *God the Father*, was the Father of God the Son before his Incarnation, and from Eternity: Yet that he could not be called *the God*, or *the Lord* of the Son, but only in conſideration of his intended Incarnation. And becauſe, the Son in the womb of the Virgin, aſſumed the whole Human Nature, and not only Fleſh, nor only a Soul, but both, therefore God the Father became *his God*, and *his Lord*, the God and the Lord, *Aug. in Pſal.* 21.

Lord, both of his Body and of his Soul. This the same Father divers times observeth, as namely on the 136 *Psalm*, and also in his *Polemicks* against the *Arians*.

To. 6. a. 17. & 19.

The Church of *England* evidently declareth the same Doctrine, in the 2 Article of Religion, in these words.

Art. Rel. 2.

Christ took Mans Nature in the Womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her Substance, so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead, and the Manhood, were joyned together in one Person.

It being granted, that Christ took the whole and perfect Human Nature upon him in the Womb; it must needs be consequently granted, that he there received his Human Soul, because neither the Flesh alone, nor the Soul alone, can be truly, and severally called *the Perfect Human Nature*. We know that the Ancient Church accounted them to be *Heretieks*, who taught that Christ assumed only his Flesh, but not his Human Soul, in the Womb of the Virgin.

Athan. de haer. a. 21. Epip. haer. 77.

The *Athanasian* Creed also declareth, that *Christ was Man, of the Substance of his Mother — Perfect God, and Perfect Man.* He could not be Perfect Man, of the Substance of his Mother, except he had received both his Flesh and his Soul from her, otherwise

Athan. Symb.

otherwise by her, he could have been but *Semivir*, i. an imperfect or half-man.

The true and real Union of the Son of God with Mankind, consisteth in the assumption of his Flesh and Soul from Mankind, by which assumption, *the Son of God became the Son of Man*, and by it only he is stiled *Emanuel*. And the Union of Mankind with Christ (which is called *Eating the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drinking his Blood*) consisteth only in the propagation or derivation of our Bodies and Souls, with the Body and Soul of Christ, from that one Original Mass and Fountain of all Human Bodies and Souls, *viz.* from *Adam*, in whose loyns and Soul all Mankind, with Christ himself, were in the beginning United.

CHAP. XXII.

THE Doctrine of this *Union*, is so necessarily to be joyned, and considered with the grand Doctrine of our *Redemption* by Christ, that it cannot reasonably be by us apprehended, how our bodies or our souls, can with *Divine Justice* be redeemed by him, without the mutual

Union of his Body and Soul with our bodies and souls. For if Christ must necessarily have taken his Flesh of Man, because he might not otherwise destroy, *or condemn sin in the flesh*; the like reason will hold concerning the Soul, that he might not condemn sin in the Soul, but by assuming his Soul from Man. The Soul by sin fell as much as the Body, or rather much more; for the transgression of Gods Command, was principally or soly the act of the Soul, the body did but only execute that which the Soul prescribed and dictated. The body by it self could not sin, more than a sword by it self can wound, or a pen alone can write. St. *Austin* often tells us, and truly, *Non peccat, nisi Anima*, only the Soul sinneth.

Rom. 8. 3

Aug. de Gen. lib. 10. c. 11.

The same kind of Arguments, by which the Fathers answered and confuted those Hereticks, who denied the traduction of the Body of Christ, from the body of the first Man, are as firm and strong to confute the other sort of Hereticks, who denied the propagation of the Soul of Christ from the Soul of the first Man; both which Heresies depraved, and indeed destroyed, and nulled the Doctrine of Redemption of our Bodies and Souls, by the Body and Soul of Christ.

Epiphanius, and after him St. *Austin* report this as the Heresie of *Apollinarius*, that he affirmed, that Christ had no Human or Intellectual Soul, but that his Godhead supplied all the Offices, and actions of a reasonable Soul in his Body. *Epip. hær. 77. Aug. in Job. Tract. 47.*

St. Jerome and St. Austin charge *Origen*, that he had taught, that the Souls of Men were more Ancient than their Bodies, and that they were created before their Bodies, and that they came from Heaven, this error of *Origen* appeareth in his Third Book *Perj. Archoon*, in which he agreeth with the Opinions of *Plato* and *Aristotle*, who had said, that the Souls of Men were not derived from their Ancestors, but came from without θύραθεν καὶ ἠρανόθεν. *Hier. 2. 42. Aug. Epist. 27. Orig. Per. Arch. l. 3. c. 3. & Lib. 4. c. 2.*

These erroneous Opinions, disturbed the doctrine of our redemption by Christ, which Redemption necessarily presupposeth an Union of our souls with the Soul of Christ, which Union cannot otherwise be found, but only in the Original Fountain of all our Souls, *viz.* in the Soul of the first Man.

Let it now be considered, whether the present vulgar Opinions, and the Doctrines of some Divines and Neoterick Writers, be not altogether as destructive of the doctrine of Redemption, as those Errors of

the aboveſaid Ancient Hereticks were, ſeeing theſe Men affirm, that human Souls are by thouſands dayly and newly Created, whereby they buſie the Godhead with new Creations of Souls upon the quickning of every Conception, whereby they manifeſtly declare, that they deny the Union of our Souls, with the Soul of Chriſt in the firſt Man, and conſequently deprave and nullifie the doctrine of the Redemption of our ſouls by his Soul. Certainly there muſt be a real Union of our Souls, as well as of our bodies with the Body and Soul of Chriſt, for otherwiſe he could not be a Redeemer of our bodies and ſouls.

Yet in this Doctrine concerning the Union of the Soul of Chriſt, with the Souls of us Men (which we have here aſſerted) we are not ſo to be underſtood, as if we meant or affirmed, that there is but one particular Soul of all Men, which was the error of *Averroes* an *Ethnick* Philoſopher, about 1150 Years of Chriſt, as *Tolet* reporteth; neither do we approve of the Opinion of ſome Ancient *Platonicks*, who ſaid, there was but one univerſal Soul of all Creatures in the World, which they called *Animam Mundi*, which error is taken notice of by *Euſebius*, *Nazianzen*, and *Auſtin*, who ſaid, that thoſe Heathens having a glimmering appre-

Tolet. in 3. Phy.

Euſeb. de Præ. Naz. Orat. 37. Auſt. de de Temp. Ser. 143.

apprehenſion of the Ubiquity and general Cooperation of the *Divine Spirit* with all Creatures, called it a *Soul.*

But our Aſſertion doth not in the leaſt gainſay the Plurality of the Souls of Men, more than the Plurality of their Bodies; for as multitudes of fruits and flowers, may grow and proceed from one Tree, or one Stalk, and yet, we ſay not that they are but *One fruit*, or but one *Flower*: So, although all our Bodies, and all our Souls, ſprang from that One Body, and that One Soul of the firſt Man, yet there are, and will be innumerable particular Bodies and Souls. We affirm only this, that all human Bodies are but the off-ſpring of that One firſt Body; and all human Souls, are but as the Daughters of that One Original Soul of *Adam*; neither doth the Plurality of particular Souls, hinder the Union of that multitude in their prime Original Fountain, wherein they were radically joyned.

The *Jews* uſed to ſay, that *Adams* Soul was in *David*, and the Scripture ſaith, that *The Soul of* Jonathan *was knit with the Soul of* David; and that *the multitude of Believers were of one Soul.* Theſe ſayings may be rightly underſtood of Union, not only in regard of mutual Love, Concord and Affe-

1 Sam. 18. 1. Acts 4. 32.

ction, but also in consideration of that one Original Soul, from whence all of them sprang; for the Soul of *Adam* branched out not only to *David*, but to Christ, and also to all Men in the World, and in this consideration the Soul of Jesus our Redeemer, is One with our Souls, being so knit and united with ours as is said, therefore the holy Man *Macarius* thus writeth thereof. *Una anima est Ecclesiæ apud Deum, quia habet Communionem cum Sponso cœlesti,* The Church is as one Soul with God, having Communion with her Heavenly Spouse, or one Soul is a Church, as St. *Paul* saith of the Husband and Wife, (as the resemblance of Christ and his Church.) *They two shall be one flesh*—and, *I speak of Christ and his Church*, and *Nazianzen* calls *Basil*, *Dimidium animæ.*

Macar. Hom. 14.

Eph. 5. 31

Naz. Orat. 19.

As for those speeches concerning Union of Souls, which fell from Heathen Writers, I take to be meant only, of the amity and concord of Friends, as that of *Horace* and *Virgil*,—*Animæ dimidium meæ.* And of *Persius*,

Hor. Od. 3.

Pers. Sat. 5.

——*Quantaque nostræ*
Pars tua sit cornute animæ—And of *Ovid*,

Ovid de Trist.

Qui duo corporibus, mentibus unus erant,

And of *Aristotle* concerning two Friends,

Mis

Μία ψυχὴ δύο σωμάτων ἐστίαν. For these Heathens did not understand the mystery, nor the great concernment of the Union of our souls, with the Soul of Christ, our God Incarnate. *Diog. in Vit. Arist.*

CHAP. XXIII.

WE have shewed before, that by reason of the Union of the flesh of Christ with our flesh, Christ and his Church are looked on, and considered as one Body, and are so called by the Apostle, *Ye are the Body of Christ.* Much rather may we be said to be One with Christ, by reason of the Union of his Soul with our Souls; for otherwise the great *Mystical Body*, or Church of Christ, wanting the life or soul of her Head, would be but as a *Carcass* or lifeless Body, neither could we be perfectly and compleatly so, as the Apostle saith of the *Galatians*, *Ye are all one in Christ Jesus*, except our souls be united with his Soul; nor can this Union of Souls, be any other way apprehended, or possibly effected, but only by the Propagation of His and our Souls, from the Original Soul of the first Man. 1 Cor. 12. 27. Gal. 3. 28

The Doctrine of the Propagation of all human Souls, from that one, and only created Soul of *Adam*, is not new, but was anciently taught and received very early, in the Primitive Church, although it was not fully eſtabliſhed by general conſent.

Tert. de Anima. Cap. 27. *Tertullian* in his Book *de Anima*, clearly declareth, *Animas ab Adamo eſſe*, that our Souls are derived from *Adam*; and again in the ſame Book he ſaith, *Omnis Anima in Adamo cenſetur, donec in Chriſto recenſeatur*, Every Soul is cenſed, or accounted in *Adam*, untill it is new enrolled and accounted in Chriſt. St. *Jerome* acknowledgeth this to be the Doctrine and judgment of *Tertullian*, and he farther addeth, *Animas ex traduce, maxima pars Occidentalium autumant, ut quomodo corpus ex corpore, ſic anima naſcatur ex anima, &c.* The greateſt part of the Weſtern Church holdeth, that as our body was derived from the Body, ſo our ſouls do ſpring from Souls. St. *Auſtin* alſo diſputeth very eagerly for the *Traduction* of Souls, yet neither he, nor St. *Hierome* would then preſume to determine that difficult queſtion.

Jd. ibid. Cap. 40.

Hier. ad Marcellinum Ep. 82. To. 2. p. 254.

Aug. Epiſt. 28.

Aug. Epiſt. 157. *Pelagius* the Heretick was one of them, who denied the *Traduction* of Souls from the firſt Man, and preſuming thereon, uſed that denial as a principle Argument againſt Tradu-

Traduction of *Original sin* from our Parents, for surely, if our Souls be not derived from them, and so originally from *Adam*, we should not be liable to the guilt of his sin, because the Soul only is the seat of sin, as is before shewed.

They that affirm and believe, that God doth yet dayly create new Souls, may consider whether they do not thereby manifestly fall into the Heresie of *Pelagianism*, for by denying the propagation of the Soul (which they confess of the Body) they consequently disbelieve the Traduction of Original sin, which cannot be derived by the body alone, because only the Soul is the seat, and subject of sin. *Aug. Tom. 3. p. 72.*

Let them also consider, whether (by affirming, that God doth dayly create new Souls) they do not thereby charge God to be the Author of sin, seeing sin is only in, and by the Soul?

Those Scriptures, which they use to alledge for the dayly creation of Human Souls, will in no wise serve their turn. As *God giveth life to all*, and, *In him we live, and move*, and, *We are his off-spring*; for it is true, that God giveth life, although it be by Propagation of life, and we live by his gift, and we are his *off-spring*; because the first Soul was created by Him immediately, from which Acts 17. 25. 28.

which first Soul, all succeeding Souls were, are, and still will be derived.

That Saying in *Ecclesiastes*, *the Spirit* (or Soul) *shall return to God who gave it.* This doth not in the least gainsay the Doctrine of Propagation of souls from *Adam's* Soul, nor doth it at all prove a daily Creation of new Souls. We confess that God gave the first Soul to the first Man, immediately by himself, and we affirm, that God daily giveth Souls, but this daily Gift is not by way of any new Creation, but only by way of Propagation from that First Soul, which Propagation is effected by his daily Concurrence, and Divine Cooperation with his Creatures, and not otherwise. And so also, God daily is Operative in making Human bodies, although not by way of Creation, but by his Concurrence, and Assistance with the ordinary means of Generation; So that if we be asked, who made us? We may truly answer God.

Eccles 12. 7.

These are the ways whereby God hath wrought from the Beginning, untill this Day, and this upon a most Mercifull design, *viz.* To make us capable of Redemption, by the Union of our bodies and Souls with the Body and Soul of the Redeemer.

Hitherto (Good Reader) we have endeavoured

deavoured to shew the *Union* of Christ with Mankind, which we have said to consist in this, that Christ hath assumed both his Body and his Soul, from that One, and the same Root and Fountain, from which, all Men with Him received their Bodies and Souls, and wherein He, and we were originally united.

Now we are necessarily to enquire, how Christ can be quitted (more than we) from that stain of corruption, which is propagated from the loyns of the First Man, and is called *Original sin*, of which we are next to consider.

CHAP. XXIV.

CHrist being the Redeemer, must necessarily be untainted, and free from all sin, not only *Actual* (which no Christian will deny him to be) but also from *Original sin*, otherwise he cannot take away the sins of others, but would require another to take away his sin.

The legal Type of the Redeemer was, *a Lamb without blemish*, and himself being the Evangelical *Antitype*, is just so described by St. *Peter*, *A Lamb without blemish* Ex. 12. 5. 1 Pet. 1. 19.

or

or ſpot; he is deſcribed by the Prophet, *to be lead like a Sheep to the ſlaughter*. Sheep have no ſin; St. *Paul* ſaith, *he knew no ſin*. St. *John* ſaith, *In him was no ſin*. And that it was needfull for us, that he ſhould be ſo, we are taught by the Apoſtle; *Such an High Prieſt became us, who is holy, harmleſs, undefiled*. Chriſt challenged his moſt malitious Cenſurers, the *Jews*, *Which of you convinceth me of ſin?* But how it came to paſs, that Chriſt could be free from that Univerſal contagion, wherein all the other whole Race of Mankind are involved, is now our Queſtion.

Isa. 53.7. 2 Cor. 5.21. 1 John 3.5. Heb. 7.26. John 8.46.

To this Queſtion, I have anſwered at large in one of my former Books, and I truſt Satisfactorily, which I ſhall not need to rehearſe fully in this place, but only to point at the moſt concerning, and principal Paſſages thereof ſummarily, and as briefly as I can.

Lib. 3. c. 21. De Incarn.

The Firſt ſin, that was charged on our firſt Parents, was *their eating of the forbidden fruit*; but that ſin was not by them tranſmitted to their Poſterity, for we did not eat thereof; nor can their Poſterity be charged with the *Sin*, but only with the *Curſe*: For that firſt ſin made them, and all their Off-ſpring, Chriſt and all, liable and ſubject to the Curſe denounced upon ſin,

ſin, which was *Mortality*; *In the day thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die.* Hence it is, that not only we, but Chriſt alſo, by taking his Fleſh and his Soul from them, became liable to death, yet He without ſin; therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, *Chriſt was made a Curſe for us*; and, *by Man came death*; and, *in Adam all die.* The Curſe was *Death*, and that Curſe fell not only upon us, but alſo upon Chriſt, as St. *Auſtin* very truly obſerveth, that *Chriſt derived mortality, from the ſubſtance and mortality of his Mother, but not ſin.* The Apoſtle ſaith, *The wages of ſin is Death*; the Death of Chriſt, was the wages of the ſin of *Adam* and *Eve*, but not of the ſin of Chriſt, for he had no ſin; therefore the Apoſtle very warily declareth, That *God ſent his Son in the likeneſs of ſinfull fleſh*, he doth not ſay, *in the likeneſs of fleſh*, for his Fleſh was real and true fleſh, and not only a bare ſimilitude thereof, as the *Manichees* ſaid, but he ſaith, *in the likeneſs of ſinfull fleſh*, that is, although the Fleſh of Chriſt was not ſinfull, yet it was like the fleſh of other Men, which is ſinfull in them, *He was in all parts tempted like as we are, yet without ſin.*

Gen. 2. 17. Gal. 3. 13. 1 Cor. 15. 21, 22. *Aug. cont. Julia. Pelag. l. 5.* Ro. 6. 23. Rom. 8. 3. *Aug. Epiſt. 74.* Heb. 4. 15.

The ſecond ſin of our firſt Parents, which is properly, that *Original ſin*, which is from them propagated, and tranſmitted into

to all their Posterity, which have proceeded from the loyns of *Adam*, and the womb of *Eve*, by the ordinary natural way of Copulation and Generation, is that sin, which the Scripture *calleth Concupiscence* or *Lust*, in which lust or concupiscence, all children are begotten, and the lust wherein they are begotten, is transmitted into them from their Parents, and remaineth in them as long as they live.

He that will carefully peruse the History of our first Parents, both before and after their fall, may discern, what sin of theirs that was, which they left as an inheritance, entayled upon all their Posterity, which naturally proceeded from them. We find that before the Fall, *they were both naked, and were not ashamed*; but after the Fall, they were ashamed and *affraid, because they were naked, and hid themselves*, and to cover that, of which they were most ashamed, they made them *Aprons of fig-leaves*, *Perizomata*, which served to cover only their Secret parts, not their breasts, or faces, or hands, and this they did, because in those Parts their lust or concupiscence appeared, for before their Fall, lust had not entred into them, neither had the Man known the Woman till after the Fall, which is noted first, *Gen.* 4. 1. where it is

Gen. 2. 25.

Gen. 3. 7, 10.

first

first said, *Adam knew Eve his Wife, and she conceived and bare Cain*, who was the First-fruit of their Concupiscence. Afterwards it is said, *Adam begot a Child in his own likeness—and called his name* Seth, (that is) in a condition of sin, like unto his Father, for although *Seth* was a good Son, yet he, as much as his brother *Cain*, was begotten in sin, in lust and concupiscence, wherein also, all the succeeding Generations from *Adam* and *Eve*, unto this day are begotten, *viz.* in lust and concupiscence. And this Concupiscence is that Original sin, whereof the Psalmist saith, *I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my Mother conceive me.* The *Apostle* saith the same of all Men, in consideration of this *Original sin*: *Death passed on all Men, for that all have sinned.* Divers Expositors put this glosse upon those words (*excepto Christo*) they meant that all have sinned, except only Christ, which is true, and may thus be cleared.

Gen. 4. 1. Gen. 5. 3. Psal. 51. 5. Ro. 5. 12.

The Generation of Christ, was far different from all other Generations of Mankind, for it was without Copulation and carnal Concupiscence, because he was born of a Virgin, without the Cooperation of Man, which was so designed by the Godhead, on purpose to preserve the most holy Body and Soul of the Redeemer without

out sin; which being of so great concernment for our comfort to be known, was foretold by God himself first, then by his Prophets, then by his Angel; *The Seed of the Woman must bruise the Serpents head*, no mention of a Man, *Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son*; And, *The Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, a Woman shall compass a Man.* 1. *A Woman* only, without a Man. 2. *Created*, therefore it was the Extraordinary and Omnipotent work of the Creator. 3. *A new thing*, for it never was so before with any Woman, nor will ever be so again. 4. *To compass a Man*, i. to inclose a Man-child in the womb of a Woman, and she a Virgin, utterly unknown by Man, this is the peculiar Work of the Godhead. Although *Turks* say, they have always such Births among them; therefore Christs Birth of the Virgin was no marvel. So *Buddas* the *Indian* was falsly said to be the Son of a Virgin.

Gen. 3. 15
Isa. 7. 14.
Jer. 31 22.
Balam n. 54. Hier. con. Jovinian. n. 14.

This Prophetical Woman, was the blessed Virgin *Mary*, who was declared by the Heavenly *Angel Gabriel*, to be a pure Virgin after her *Espousals*, and after the *Conception*, and after the *Birth* of her Son *Jesus*. And because the Mother of the Redeemer, was necessary to have been a Virgin, therefore all our Church Creeds de-

Mat. 1. Luke 1.

clare

clare the same, *That Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary, That he was Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, That he was Man, of the Substance of his Mother*; and in the *Symbolical Hymn of S. Ambrose*, and St. *Austin*, it is said of him, *When thou tookest upon thee to deliver Man, thou didst not abhor the Virgins Womb.* In all these, notice is given of the Woman, and Virgin, without any mention of Man; the Redeemer was to be answerable to *Melchisedech*, Ἀπάτωρ, as St. *Austin* saith, *Sine Matre Deus, sine Patre Homo*, he was God from Eternity, of the Substance of the Father, but Man, of the Substance of his Virgin Mother only, from whom he received both his Flesh and Soul.

Symb. Apostol. Nicen. Athanas. Ambros.

Heb. 7. 3. *Aug. To. 7. a. 3.*

CHAP. XXV.

IT being granted or presumed, that Christ received both his Flesh, and his Soul from the blessed *Virgin Mother*, and she hers from our first Parents. We are yet farther to enquire, how his Flesh and Soul could be free from that Original sin, except we will also grant, that his Mother was conceived without sin, which I suppose, no

Dominicani & Franciscani differunt in hac re.

no Learned, or but Intelligent Divine will affirm, it being accounted by St. *Austin*, one of the *Pelagian Herisies*, who yet refused to dispute against her in that Question, *Propter honorem Domini*, as he saith.

Aug. cont. Pelag. T. 7. n. 36.

Our Answer is, that although Christ derived both his Flesh and his Soul from the Virgin, and although his Virgin Mother was certainly conceived in sin, and therefore not without Original sin, during her whole life; yet Christ did not with his Flesh and Soul, derive any sin from her, because he was not by her conceived in sin, *viz.* in lust or concupiscence. For *Original sin is not derived into us, by receiving our Flesh and our Souls from our Mothers, but only by concupiscence and lust*, whereby ordinary Conceptions are produced. But Christ was conceived of the Virgin, by the *Holy Ghost*, without man, and so without lust, and therefore without any sin, which is the reason rendred by S. *Austin*, *Nulla concupiscentia carnali seminatus est Christus, ergo nullum peccatum Originaliter traxit*, i. That because Christ was not begotten, or conceived in carnal lust, therefore his Conception was without sin; so *Isychius* answereth, *Christi humanitas munda est, ut quæ non genita est ex Viri immunditia*, Christs whole human Nature was clean, because not begotten in uncleanness;

Aug. T. 3. N. 73.

Aug. in Enchir. T. 3. n. 58

Isych. in Levit. Lib. 1. c. 14.

cleanness; so that although both the Flesh, and the Soul of the Virgin Mother were stained with Original sin, yet the Flesh and Soul of Christ sprang from her, without her sin, because he was conceived without carnal Copulation and Lust.

Sometimes (we know) worms are bred in mens Bodies, and derive their flesh and bulk from them, yet it would be ridiculous to say or imagin, that these worms draw original sin from those Human bodies, because they are therein bred, without any copulation or carnal concupiscence. *Herod was eaten of worms*, which were bred in his own body, yet those worms by that Generation, did not derive any sin from *Herod*. And if now any Man should be miraculously produced, and formed out of another mans Body, he should not thereby attract any sin, because such a Production would be without copulation and lust, as *Aquinas* determined. Acts 12. 23. *Aquin. 1. 2, 9, 81. Art. 4.*

Origen in his 14 Homilie on St. *Luke*, and St. *Austin* on the 21 Psalm, and in other places, both of them do expound those words of *David*, Psal. 22. 6. *I am a worm, and no Man*; to be meant of the Conception of Christ. *Quia vermis non alitur de, sed in corpore Origo est*, because Christ was bred in the Body of his Mother *Orig. T. 2. N. 44. Aug. in Psal. 21.*

without Copulation, as worms are in other Bodies, and therefore without sin. *Eve* her self was made of *Adam's* Body and Soul, without any Copulation or lust, and therefore without any derivation of sin; indeed her Extraction was before the Fall, and before Concupiscence was entred into the Man, which yet (I conceive) would have so been, although the Woman had not been so made, till after the Fall of the Man.

For certain then, the blessed Mother of our Redeemer was a pure Virgin, untill the Birth of her Son *Jesus*; but whether she continued and persevered in her Virginity, untill her death is not necessary, or much pertinent to be considered in this Question, it being a full, and sufficient argument of the pure and sinless Conception, and Birth of Christ, that he was *born of the Virgin Mary*, during her Virginity. *Mariam Joseph concubitu nec cognoverat, nec cogniturus erat.* August. To. 7. N. 52.

Yet in the Primitive Church, both *Eastern and Western*, it was generally received as a Truth, that she persisted in her Virginity to her death. Μαεία ἀεὶ Παρθένος, the Greeks said, and the Latines, as *Austin* declares, *Maria Virgo, concipiens, pariens, moriens.* It was so near an Article of their Faith,

Aug. de Catechi. Rudib. c. 22. To. 4.

Faith, that such as denied her perpetual Virginity, as *Helvidius* in St. *Jerome*, and *Jovinian* in St. *Austin*, were accounted Hereticks, and such are put by *Epiphanius* in his Catalogue of Heresies, under the title of *Antidicimarianitæ* with us, since her departure, she is called to this day *the Virgin Mary*. *Hier. con. Helv. An. To. 7. n. 55. Epiph. Hær. 78.*

There is a *Prophetical Allegory* recorded by the Prophet in these words, *The Vision of all is become unto you, as the words of a Book that is sealed, which Men deliver to one that is Learned, saying, Read this I pray thee, and he saith I cannot, for it is sealed.* This Allegory is thus unriddled by St. *Chrysostome*, and before him by *Gregory Neocæsaria* (except one of them, or his Scribe borrowed it from the other) they expound it of the Virgin *Mary*, and *Lyranus* saith, it was indeed meant of the secret Coming of Christ. Isa. 29. 11. *Chry. n. 59 Greg. Neo. n. 2. Lyra in loc.*

The *Book* signifieth the Virgin Mother, the *Sealing* of it was the design of God, to preserve her in a Virgin Estate to be Ἔμψυχον παλατιον καὶ ναὸν Θεοῦ, a living Palace, and Temple to entertain God; *the Man* to whom this Book was delivered, signified *Joseph*, who is said to be *Learned* (*sciens literas*) because he had a former Wife, and also Children by her, (as some say) yet he could not, or might not *open or read* this new Book, because it was *sealed*, or kept shut,

for a great and Heavenly purpose, such as is before said. *Thus they*, just so *St. Ambrose and St. Austin*, expound that Vision of *Ezechiel*, concerning the *shut Gate, by which no Man might enter, because the God of* Israel *hath entred in by it.* This Gate signified *Mary*, who was *semper intacta*, Joseph *vir non transit per eam, Deus* Israel *ingressus est eam.* The Virgin Mother, is often called by the Fathers *Porta Cœli*, and a Book hath the name of the Writer, as *the Eunuch read* Isaias, *Acts* 8. 28. And *Moses is read every Sabbath-day.* St. *Austin* calls himself a Book, *Nos sumus Codex eorum qui legere non noverunt.* So the Virgin *Mary* is that Book.

Ezek. 44. 2.

Ambr. n. 49. *Aug.* T. 10. n. 51.

Acts 15. 21. *Aug.* Ps. 121.

This I trust is enough, to shew the meaning of those Mysterious words of Christ, concerning the *Eating of his Flesh*, and *Drinking his Blood.*

The CONCLUSION.

HItherto we have shewed the *Real Union* of Christ with Mankind, both in Flesh, and in Soul, and the *Modus* or manner, how it is brought to pass. And that it doth not consist in Eating, and Drinking the Sacramental Bread and Wine, for without that Men may be Redeemed and Saved;

but

but not, *except they Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood.*

Now for Conclusion, I shall only enquire, what effects and issues are produced by this *Union*, which is signified by Eating and Drinking.

And these I find to be Two. 1. *Immortality* of all Human Souls whatsoever, because all Men, good and bad, are united with Christ in Soul. 2. The *Resurrection* of all Human Bodies, both of holy and unholy Persons, because all are united with Christ in Flesh. Both the effects may clearly appear by the words of Christ.

For First he saith, *Except ye Eat the Flesh, &c. ye have no life in you*; therefore they that have so eaten his Flesh, *&c.* have life in them. John 6. 53.

Secondly, In the very next words he saith, *Whoso eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, hath Eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the Last day.* 1. *Eternal Life*, is meant of the Immortality of all Human Souls. 2. *Raising up at the Last day*, signifieth the Resurrection of Human Bodies at the last Judgment. 54.

From these Premises we may easily collect, that because all Men, both Good and Bad, are really united with Christ, both in Soul and Flesh (as hath been proved before)

fore) therefore all Men, both good and bad, shall have Eternal life, *viz.* Immortality of Souls, and Resurrection of Bodies.

If it be questioned, whether the Damned may be said to have *Eternal life*, because they have been united with Christ, so as is said?

We answer Yes. For their Souls are Immortal, as really as the Souls of the Blessed, and their Bodies shall be raised to Life at the general Resurrection, as truly as the Bodies of the Saints; both the Blessed and the Damned, in Bodies and in Souls, shall then have Everlasting life, the one in happiness, the other in Misery.

Bez. Cat. p. 31. And although the Miserable State and condition of the Damned (as *Beza* saith) is not worthy to be called *Life*, and is therefore called *Eternal Death*, and *Everlasting Damnation*, yet it is such a death as is called *Mors sine morte*, & Θάνατος Ἀθάνατος, it is a living death, and endless living in misery; it is a life, though worse than death, or annihilation, and such an everlasting life as *Devils* have. The mention of *Everlasting fire*, implieth everlasting Bodies, and in that it is said, that *Death is to be destroyed*; this argues, that then there will be no more Dying, and therefore it is said, *The Dead shall be raised incorruptible*; And *this mortal shall put on Immortality*, and this is true, both of

Aug. T. 13. n. 31. Ietan. Longa sic morte necabat, Virg. Æn. l. 5. 1 Cor. 15. 26.

52. 54.

of the Good, and of the Bad, *for all must stand before the Judgment-Seat of Christ*; and this is confessed in all our Church Creeds. *The Resurrection of the Body, and Life Everlasting*, and that *we look for both*, and that *all Men shall rise with their Bodies, and shall give an account*; All, therefore Good and Bad. Rom. 14. 10. *Apost. Nicen. Athen.*

This being evident, we are further to enquire, what is the efficient, or true cause of the Immortality of Human Souls, and of the Resurrection of Human Bodies, more than of the souls and bodies of other inferior Creatures, although their bodies and souls were at first Created by God, as ours were; and therefore the *Mahumetans* say, that there shall be a Resurrection of Brute Creatures, as *Armachanus* reporteth; and Heathens said, that in their *Elysium*, a place was for Birds, as *Ovid. Amorum*, L. 2. *Eleg.* 6. *Arm. f.* 161.

Colle sub Elysio nigra nemus illice frondet,
Udaque perpetuo gramine terra viret.
Si qua fides dubiis volucrum locus ille piarum
Dicitur, obscœnæ quo prohibentur Aves. *Ovid. Amorum li.* 2. *El.* 6.

To this our Answer is, That because Human bodies and Souls, are united with the Body and Soul of Christ, in the first Original Soul and Body, therefore our Souls are Immortal, and our Bodies shall rise immortal;

tal; but so shall not the other Creatures, because they are not so united. The reason is clearly declared by Christ himself in these
John 6. 57. words, *He that eateth me, even he shall live by me.* For as the Body and Soul of Christ are now Immortal, because united with the
Ibid. Divine Spirit, as himself saith, *I live by the Father*, so our Souls are, and our Bodies shall be Immortal, because they are united with the Body and Soul of *the Son of God*; and this, not by vertue of his meer Soul, and his meer Flesh, both of them being of themselves but Creatures, but because his Soul and Body are, and ever were personally united with the Divine Spirit, or Godhead; that is it only, which caused this kind of Vitality in all Mankind, for of his meer Flesh
Joh. 6. 63 alone Christ saith, *The Flesh profiteth nothing.* But of the Spirit or Godhead, united with his Flesh, he saith, *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life*; and therefore the *Apostle* saith of the whole Person of
1 Cor. 15. 45. Christ, *The last Adam was made a quickning Spirit*, that is, He was made so by Union with the Godhead, for the Flesh of Christ alone was mortal, but by this Union, it became both *Vital* and *Vivifical*.

They that say, that our Souls are Immortal only by Creation, being *Reasonable* Souls,

and

and should have been *Immortal*, though God the Son had not united himself with our Nature. These to me, seem to gainsay the words of Christ, for it is not by the Reasonableſs, but their Union with the Soul of Christ, that makes them immortal: I suppose, they will not say, that our Bodies shall rise from death, only because they are human Bodies: No, for both these are the effects of this Union, which Christ called the *Eating his Flesh, and Drinking his Blood*, and nothing else; and therefore St. *John* saith, *God hath given to us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son*; he addeth, *He that hath the Son hath Life, and he that hath not the Son hath not Life.* 1 John 5. 11, 12.

To this most Holy Son of God, and Son of Man, *our ever blessed Redeemer and Saviour, together with the Eternal Father, and the Divine Spirit of both, Benediction, Honour and Thanksgiving for ever and ever.* Amen, Amen.

FINIS.

THE CONTENTS.

Chapter.

1. THE *Union of Christ with Mankind in* Adam, *in order to our Redemption, signified by the Eating and Drinking the Flesh and Blood of Christ; the different understanding thereof, by* Romanists, Lutherans *and* Zuinglians, *from the Church of* England.

2. *The signification of eating of the Tree of Life, of the Tree of Knowledge, of Manna, of Sacrifices, and of the Paschal Lamb.*

3. *That Eating the Flesh of Christ, is not meant of Oral Eating, of St.* Peters *Eating, paralleld with our Eating of Christ.*

4. *That the necessity of our real Union with the Flesh of Christ, is called Eating; how we are united with his Body, and the benefit thereof.*

5. *The Doctrine of the Fathers concerning our Union with the Body of Christ; of his Body natural & mystical. Of the Subjection of Christ*

6. *Why this Union is described, by eating the Flesh*

Flesh of the Son of Man, and not rather of the Son of God.

7. *That the Redeemer was necessarily to be the Son of Man, and also the Son of God.*

8. *Why this Union is expressed by such Tragical words, of eating his Flesh, and drinking his Blood. Why the Primitive Church mingled water with Wine in the holy Chalice.*

9. *The practice of some Heretick, in eating Human flesh in their Sacrament, compared with the Doctrine of Transubstantion. The calumny of Anthropophagy charged upon Christians, and removed.*

10. *That this Eating the Flesh of Christ is now to be done, for that it was performed at our first Conception in the Womb; that the Fathers, and all other Latin Translators, render those words of Eating the Flesh of Christ, otherwise then we do.*

11. *How our Union with the Flesh of Christ, is more beneficial to us, than our Union with the flesh of the Patriarks, Prophets and Apostles.*

12. *Of Eating the Flesh of Christ Spiritually, what is meant by it, and whether such an Eating be sufficient to the right end.*

13. *Of Eating by Faith; whether believing the Articles of Faith be that Eating, which is thereby meant. Of those words of St.* Austin, Crede & Manducasti, *how to be rightly*

rightly understood. The three states of Mankind.

14. Of the Blood of Christ, that it is not literally to be understood, nor to be drank Orally.

15. Of the forbidding of Blood, by the Law and the Gospel; that it was but a Temporary Discipline. Why Fornication was forbidden to the Gentiles converted by the Apostolical Council.

16. That the Blood of Christ, signifieth the Life, or Soul of Christ.

17. That Drinking the Blood of Christ, signifieth only the Union of our Souls with his Soul. Of the 3 Ingredients in Christ, The Godhead, Flesh and Soul.

18. To what end, and special purpose the Holy Supper was instituted; the abuse by withholding the Chalice from the People; that the corporal Presence of Christ is not in the Sacraments, but in the Communicants.

19. That the Soul of Christ, and all other Human Souls are derived from the Original soul of Adam; that the Doctrine of daily Creation of new Human Souls is erroneous; that our Souls proceed immediately from our Mothers, and in the Womb.

20. Of the Traduction or Propagation of the Soul of Christ, and of all other Human Souls

Souls from Adam. *Some doubts and objections cleared; The true cause of the Immortality of Human Souls, and of the Resurrection of our Bodies, more than of brute Creatures.*

21. *Of the time when Conceptions receive life and soul in the Womb, which is called Quickning.* Of Barrenness. *That the Union of our souls with the Soul of Christ, is at our Quickning in the Womb; the Doctrine of the Church of* England *therein.*

22. *That the Soul of Christ must as necessarily have proceeded from* Adam, *as his Flesh; Of some Heresies, which gainsayed the Traduction of Souls; The Doctrine of daily Creation of new Souls examined.*

23. *The judgment of the Fathers concerning Traduction of Souls; The error of the* Pelagians *therein, and the evil consequences thereof.*

24. *That Christ was free from Original sin, although his Soul and Body were derived from* Adam.

25. *That although the Mother of Christ were conceived in sin, yet her Son Jesus was free from her Sin, and how. That she was a pure Virgin at the Birth of Christ. That her perseverance in Virginity to her Death, though*

though it is true, yet it is not necessary pertinent to this question.

Conclusion.

The Effects of our Union with Christ, viz.
1. The Immortality of all Human Souls.
2. The Resurrection of all Human Bodies, which are called Eternal Life, and Raising at the last Day.

FINIS.